MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES.

Baltimore, January, 1889.

THE FRENCH HISTORICAL INFINITIVE.—I.

I. Existing Theories.

The historical infinitive, as it appears in Modern French, is one of those constructions which make us ask ourselves,—how did this mode of expression arise? and accordingly in almost every French grammar we find some attempt at explaining this somewhat unusual form of speech.

Let us see what some of these explanations are:—

Aubertin ('Grammaire moderne des écrivains français.' Paris, 1861. L. ix, §4) represents the infinitive as the earliest form which the verb assumes in our consciousness, hence in animated conversation, where we have no time to get beyond this first form, we make use of it instead of the finite verb; and he adds: "Le *de* est euphonique comme on en a tant vu . . .". Aubertin seems to have a dim notion that we ought to find in the popular consciousness the same series which we have in French grammars, where the infinitive always stands first in the paradigm. A. Chassang ('Nouvelle grammaire française.' Paris, 1880) speaking of our infinitive says, §330: "C'est un souvenir de l'infinitif de narration si usité en latin." He does not tell us how or why this remembering took place, or whether it was the people or the learned who remembered, so that we are just as wise as we were before. Littré in his dictionary under *de* (§20) says: "*De* devant un infinitif et pris absolument, c'est-à-dire sans nom ou verbe dont il soit le complément. On les appela, eux de courir, c'est-à-dire, sous-entendu, ils commencèrent, ils se hâtèrent de courir." This explanation, which we shall meet again in the Latin grammarians, is a logically satisfactory analysis of the meaning of this expression, and hence it is the one most generally met with, but a development of this infinitive such as Littré here presupposes, is by no means probable. We should have to assume a tendency in the popular mind to disregard time relations in excited narration; but as it is impossible to conceive of anything taking place, without at the same time conceiving it as taking place at some time—since a time element is an essential part of all our ideas—some expression of this time element is absolutely indispensable. One could answer, it is true, that in the closely connected sentences in which the historical infinitive occurs, the 'time when' is already sufficiently determined by the preceding clause. But on the one hand, it is hard to believe that *ils commencèrent*—can ever have been used in such hurried speech, and what has never been in use can not of course be suppressed, and on the other hand if they ever did use *ils commencèrent* in such a connection, it is hard to believe that in their hurry they would have suppressed the finite verb, and have left out the *de* which is so closely connected with it.—P. Clairin ('Du génitif latin et de la préposition *de*.' Paris, 1880) adopts Littré's explanation.

The earliest instance where this explanation is suggested in a French grammar, as far as I know, is found in Petrus Ramus, 'Grammaire Françoise' 1562 cited by Livet ('La grammaire Française et les grammairiens du XVIe siècle.' Paris, 1859) p. 251: "Le verbe déliberatif gouverne linfiny: tu veulx aymer ... Quelquefois le verbe déliberatif est supprimé: et matins de courir et nous daller après."

These are all the attempts at an explanation which I have been able to find among French grammarians. They are unsatisfactory enough, as any attempt must be to explain an obscure construction by merely considering its logical relations, without investigating its growth in the development of the language. Let us see now what German grammarians have to say about our infinitive:—Mätzner holds that it is an elliptical construction ('Syntax,' I, §223 and 'Grammatik' §150 a 4). Lücking §428 and Hölder §189 take the same view. Diez, finally, ('Grammatik,' p. 929) saw that the construction could not be explained by an ellipsis. "Aus einer Ellipse ist dies gewiss nicht zu erklären; das vorgefügte *de* scheint seinen Grund eben nur in der Neigung dieser

Sprache zu haben, den reinen Infinitiv mit dem präpositionalen zu vertauschen." We shall see, further on whether there is not a more satisfactory explanation for the presence of the *de*, and, beyond this *de*, DIEZ does not attempt an explanation. Thus we observe that the historical infinitive in French has not as yet received any explanation at all satisfactory to the historical grammarian.

II.—THE LATIN HISTORICAL INFINITIVE.

As the French historical infinitive has so often been derived from the Latin historical infinitive, and as the use of this construction is very similar in both languages, it will be worth while to consider for a moment the views of Latin grammarians, ancient and modern.

PRISCIAN, QUINTILIAN and DONATUS all hold that we have here an ellipsis of *cœpit* or *cœperunt*, showing that the usual modern explanation is a very old one. To turn to modern grammarians, we have first MAX SCHMIDT ('ÜBER den Infinitiv,' Ratibor, 1824, p. 64) and F. C. SPIESS ('Disputatio grammatica de infinitivo historico, accusativo cum infinitivo, etc.' Wiesbaden, 1846), who think that the infinitive was the first form of the verb used by barbarous nations, just as it is, according to them, the first form used by children, and that the historical infinitive is a remnant of a primitive mode of speech. It is hardly worth while discussing this wonderful conception of the speech of savages and children. We know very well now that the infinitive is by no means the earliest and simplest form of the verb.

GUSTAVUS MOHR ('De infinitivo historico,' Halle, 1878) sums up his explanation as follows: "Nam, cum infinitivus omni definita personarum et numerorum distinctione careat, animo commoto scriptoris talibus in rebus describendis hæc verbi forma aptissima erat, utpote quæ nihil nisi actionem ipsam exprimeret, ne temporis quidem significatione indicata, cum hoc in genere semper usurpetur infinitivus præsentis." I must confess that this explanation does not seem to me at all adequate. We certainly easily lose our sense of actual time relations in excited narration, but it is inconceivable to me that we could represent any event to our consciousness in such a way that no time relations, however obscure, should be connected with it. We have here again an attempt to explain a difficult construction without looking for its development in the past of the language. If, then, this theory is not tenable, there remains only the explanation of JOLLY. JOLLY ('Geschichte des Infinitivs,' München, 1873, p. 178) after disposing of the ellipsis theory and of the child-and-savage language theory, says: "So bleibt nur die dritte Annahme übrig, dass diese Infinitive sich aus der ursprünglichen Casusbedeutung der Infinitive erklären, und zwar ist klar, dass in diesen absoluten Constructionen, indem der Infinitivdativ oder Accusativ, der sich sonst an andere Bestandtheile des Satzes anzulehnen pflegte, nun einmal ganz selbstständig auftrat, sich seine Grundbedeutung concentrirte; daher kommt es, dass die alten absoluten Infinitive, wie sie überall der energischen Rede angehören, auch die ursprüngliche Energie des Casus noch am stärksten bewahrt haben." And p. 181: "Reyssig in den Vorlesungen über lateinische Sprachwissenschaft glaubt bereits den Ursprung des historischen Infinitivs in dem Rapportstyl der Kriegsberichte gefunden zu haben. Ohne bestreiten zu wollen, dass der historische Infinitiv der knappen soldatischen Ausdrucksweise besonders angemessen ist, kann ich doch derselben höchstens einen, zudem nicht nachgewiesenen Einfluss auf die weitere Verbreitung des historischen Infinitivs zuerkennen, denn der historische Infinitiv ist viel älter als die Rapporte der römischen Feldherren. Dafür zeugt vor Allem die Analogie des Litauischen, als einer uralterthümlichen Sprache; in beiden Sprachen entwickelte sich aus der vorwärts strebenden, dativischen Kraft des Infinitivs sein Gebrauch in eilfertiger, rasch voranschreitender Erzählung." A comparison with the French historical infinitive will, it is hoped, make it still clearer that this explanation is essentially correct, if we can show that the French historical infinitive was developed in very much the same way. At present I would merely observe that this so-called dative force of the infinitive would be even more likely to lead to a use of this mood instead of the imperative in vehement exhortations and appeals.

III.—Is the French Historical Infinitive derived from the Latin Historical Infinitive?

Let us now return to the historical infinitive in French. The first question we have to settle is whether this construction was derived from the Latin. This might either have taken place by unbroken transmission, or else it might have been artificially introduced by the learned. Let us first consider whether our infinitive was used without a break in the speech of the people. This certainly was not the case. The Latin historical infinitive, which was at first an expression familiar to the people, as is evident from its frequent use by the early writers of comedies (see Draeger, 'Historische Syntax der lateinischen Sprache.' Leipzig, 1878, I, p. 329), and which later on was used by a few writers of the Empire (Sallust, Tacitus, Livius) in their highly artificial language in order to add to the vividness of their word-pictures, seems to have vanished pretty early from the language of conversation. Suetonius does not have it at all, and Justinius has it only once (see Hübenthal, 'De infinitivo historico.' Halle, 1881). And if the later period be looked into, it will be found that there is no instance of the use of the historical infinitive in ecclesiastical Latin, which would hardly be the case if this expression had still been current among the people. Besides, our infinitive nowhere appears in the earliest French literature down to the thirteenth century, although it would have found a fitting place in epic poetry, and would certainly have been used if it had then belonged to the language of the people. We see thus that there can have been no uninterrupted transmission from Latin to French. We find a period of about one thousand years during which, so far as we know, the historical infinitive was not used.

We come now to the question whether the historical infinitive was incorporated into French by the learned who borrowed it from classical Latin, or whether we have here an independent development in the French itself. In order to decide this question it is of the greatest importance to find out at what time this mode of expression made its appearance in French. If we were to find that it was in the sixteenth century by Du Bellay or by Ronsard, or by some of their fellow reformers of language, it would be extremely probable that they had taken it from the Latin, although the prefixing of the *de* would still be unexplained.

Burguy ('Grammaire de la langue d'oïl' I, p. 210), and following him P. Clairin ('Du génitif latin et de la préposition *de*.' Paris, 1880, p. 241) give a single instance of the occurrence of the historical infinitive in Old French:—Et li sengliers se couche, et cil de grater ('Roman des Sept Sages de Rome,' publié par Le Roux de Lincy. Paris 1838, p. 23). The passage as printed in the original reads: Et le senglier se couche, et cil *du* grater. Le Roux de Lincy's edition is printed from a manuscript of the thirteenth century.

To this one instance I am able to add another, which was pointed out to me by Professor Tobler, in the Supplément of the 'Roman du Renart' (edited by P. Chabaille):

> Atant li autre chien sallirent
> Qui moult durement l'envayrent
> Tenir le cuidèrent et prendre,
> Mais il ne les vault pas attendre;
> Ains s'en fui sans demorer.
> *Et li levrier après d'aler,*
> Et li venerres de randon
> S'en va après tout abandon,
> Si lor eschape, molt li poise.

The manuscript is described by Ernest Martin ('Examen critique des manuscrits du Roman de Renart.' Bâle, 1872) as belonging to the fourteenth century; but the language belongs decidedly to an earlier period, so that this example, too, must be ascribed to the thirteenth century. These are the only cases I have been able to find in Old French, but they are sufficient. It would never have occurred to a writer of amusing stories in the thirteenth century to borrow the historical infinitive from Latin, and to provide it with a euphonic *de* or *du*. We must then assume that at that time our infinitive already formed a part of current speech, hence it must have developed in French itself and was not introduced by the learned.

P. B. Marcou.

Cambridge, Mass.

THE AFFINITIES OF THE 'FATA APOSTOLORUM.'

The Old English poem known as 'The Fates of the Apostles' acquires a new interest since PROFESSOR NAPIER's remarkable discovery [see *Academy* (London) for Sept. 8, 1888] that it is from the hand of CYNEWULF. Every one admits that he was the author of 'Christ,' 'Elene' and 'Juliana,' and, since the publication of RAMHORST's essay ("Das altenglische Gedicht vom heiligen Andreas und der Dichter Cynewulf," Leipzig, 1886) there can hardly be much doubt that to these should be added 'Andreas.' We accordingly have five poems, the authorship of which must be attributed to this scholarly versifier. Among others that are ascribed to him, with more or less probability, are the 'Riddles,' 'Guthlac,' 'Phœnix,' and the 'Dream of the Rood.'

The subjoined tables are intended to illustrate the affinities of the 'Fata Apostolorum,' as determined by those of its language. The method employed has been explained and illustrated in my edition of the 'Judith' (pp. 57-65, cf. p. xiv). The Verbal Correspondences are preceded by a Table, A, of words and phrases occurring in this poem, and nowhere else in GREIN's edition, so far as can be determined by his Glossary. Table B contains the correspondences with the undoubted Cynewulfian poems; Table C, with the questionable ones; while Table D contains all the rest. The additional lines published by NAPIER are numbered 96, 97 and 98.

The following conclusions may, I think, safely be drawn from these tables:—

1. A comparatively large number of peculiar words and phrases found in a poem does not militate against the supposition that the poem is by a well-known author (Table A).

2. The resemblances between the phraseology of the 'Fata Apostolorum' and that of 'Andreas,' 'Christ,' 'Elene,' and 'Juliana,' are close and numerous; hence the general principle is so far confirmed that we may expect close and numerous verbal resemblances between different poems by the same author.

3. The authorship of this poem might have been conjectured with tolerable certainty on the basis of internal evidence alone.

4. The affinities of the 'Fata Apostolorum,' as determined by this means, are not strikingly dissimilar to those of the 'Judith,' and so far my hypothesis is confirmed that the latter poem emanated from the Cynewulfian school ('Judith,' p. xiv).

5. There is some indication from this source that 'Guthlac' and 'Phœnix' are also by CYNEWULF.

A.—WORDS AND PHRASES OCCURRING NOWHERE ELSE IN OLD ENGLISH POETRY.

WORDS.

gúðhwæt, 57; *lindgelác*, 76; *síðgéomor*, 1; *sweordrǽs*, 59; *wǽpenhęte*, 80.

PHRASES.

æðelo ręccan, 24.
aldre gelǽdde, 43.
Criste léofast, 26.
dǽdum dómfæste, 5.
dæges ór onwóc, 65.
dréam æfter déaðe, 82.
dryhtlíc dóm Godes, 65.
ealdre gedǽlan, 36.
eardwíc uncúð, 93.
ęnde gesealdon, 85.
feorh ofgéfon, 12.
feorh wið flǽsce, 37.
fitte fégde 98.
for(e)þances gléaw, 96.
friðes and fultomes, 91.
geong and gúðhwæt, 57.
giddes begang, 89.
hǽðen and hygeblind, 46.
hǽðengild hýran, 47.
hildecorðor, 41.
hlyt wísode, 9.
ídle ǽhtwelan, 84.
lǽt mé on láste líc, 94.
land wæs gefǽlsod, 66.
langne hám, 92.
langsumre líf, 20.
léoht unhwílen, 20.
líðra on láde, 92.
mód onlíhted, 52.
óðre dǽlas, 51.
samnode wíde, 2.
sigeléan sécan, 81.
sín æt sæcce, 59.
síðes sǽne, 34.
sóð yppe wearð, 64.

stęnges swęng, 72.
swegle dréamas, 32.
swilt þrówode, 71.
tír unbræcne, 86.
tohtan sǽne, 75.
þæs léasan godu, 49.
þás lǽnan gestréon, 83.
þone sóðan geféan, 81.
þrym unlýtel, 8.
þurh cnéorisse, 26.
þurh fǽmnan hrif, 29.
þurh háðene hand, 60.
þurh róde cwealm, 39.
þurh sweordes bite, 34.
wælréaf wunigean, 95.
wælréow cyning, 69.
wǽpnum áswębban, 69.
wégan on gewitte, 87.
weormum tô hróðre, 95.
wund for weorudum, 61.

B.—Verbal Correspondences with Cynewulfian Poems.

ANDREAS.

1.

a. *apostolhád Ap.* 14, *An.* 1653.
léoðgiddunga, (*-inga*) *Ap.* 97, *An.* 1481.

b. *beornas beadurófe* (*beado-*) *Ap.* 78, *An.* 850.
léode lǽrde Ap. 31, *An.* 170, *cf. léode lǽran Dóm.* 47.
léode lǽrde: *þanon lífes weg Ap.* 31, *cf. léod e lǽrde on lífes weg An.* 170.
mine gefrége Ap. 25, *An.* 1628 (other instances of *mine gefrége*).
sóhton síðfrǫme Ap. 77, *An.* 641.
torhte and tíréadige. Twęlfe wǽron Ap. 4, *cf. twęlfe under tunglum tíréadige hæleð An.* 2.
þǽr hie dryhtnes ǽ déman sceoldon Ap. 10, *cf. þǽr ic dryhtnes ǽ déman sceolde An.* 1405, also, *þá þe dryhtnes á déman cúðon An.* 1196.
þéodnes þegna, þrym unlýtel Ap. 8, *cf. þéodnes þegnas; nó hira þrym álæg An.* 3.
þone hálgan héap helpe bidde Ap. 90, *cf. and ús þone hálgan helpe biddan An.* 1568.
þurh his hálig word Ap. 53, *cf. þurh þín hálig word An.* 1420.
wíde geweorðotl ofer werþéoda Ap. 15, *cf. wuldre gewlitegad ofer werþéoda An.* 543.
wurd (*wyrd*) *undyrne Ap.* 42, *An.* 1482.

2.

a. *háðengild Ap.* 47, *An.* 1104 (*cf. Jul.*).
hlyt Ap. 9, *An.* 6, 14 (*cf. El.*).

b. *beorhtne boldwelan Ap.* 33, *An.* 524 (*cf. Jul.*)
eorðan sóhte (*sécan, etc.*) *Ap.* 28, *An.* 731 (*cf. Jul.*).
fæder mancynnes Ap. 29, *An.* 848 (*cf. Sat.*)
hęriges byrhtme (*brehtme, beorhtme*) *Ap.* 21, *An.* 1204 (*cf. El.*).
ofer werþéoda Ap. 15, *An.* 543 (*cf. Ps.*); *cf. also Az.* 7, *B.* 899, *Jul.* 9, *Dan.* 286.
síðes sǽne Ap. 34, *cf. síðfǽtes sǽne An.* 204, 211 (*cf. El.*).
swegle dréamas Ap. 32, *cf. swegles dréamas An.* 641, 810 (*cf. Jud.*).
sweordrǽs fornam Ap. 59, *cf. gúðrǽs fornam An.* 1533 (*cf. B.*).
þéodnes þegna Ap. 8, *cf. þéodnes þegnas An.* 3 (*cf. B.*).

3.

a. *ǽgléaw Ap.* 24, *An.* 1485 (*cf. El. and Men*).
beaduróf Ap. 78, *An.* 96, 145, 850 (*cf. B. and El.*).
gúðplega Ap. 22, *An*, 1371 (*cf. By. and Chr.*).
wundorcræfte Ap. 55, *An.* 13, 645 (*cf. Jul. and Rid.*).

b. *dryhtnes ǽ Ap.* 10, *An.* 1405 (*cf. El. and Jul.*).
ęngla ordfruma Ap. 28, *An.* 146 (*cf. Hy. and Sat.*).
helpe bidde (*biddan etc.*) *Ap.* 90, *An.* 1033 (*cf. Ps. and Ps. L.*).
lífes weg Ap. 31, *An.* 170 (*cf. Gu. and Rood*).
síðe gesóhte Ap. 32, *An.* 847 (*cf. B. and Jul.*); *cf. also Chr.* 62, 146, *Gen.* 2425.

CHRIST.

1.

a. *unbræce Ap.* 86, *Chr.* 6.
b. *of déaðe árás.* 56, *cf. Chr. Ap*, 467.

2.

a. *lífwela Ap.* 49, *Chr.* 1348 (*cf. Dan.*).
b. *ǽn(i)ges on eorðan Ap.* 19, *Chr.* 200 (*cf. Ph.*).
þone sóðan geféan Ap. 81, *cf. sóðne géféan Chr.* 451 (*cf. Gu.*).

þurh yrne (*eorne*) *hyge Ap.* 68, *Chr.* 620 (*cf. El.*).

3.

a. *gúðplega Ap.* 22, *Chr.* 573 (*cf. An. and By.*).

ELENE.

1.

a. *ðreodian* (*ðrydian*) *Ap.* 18, *El.* 549, 1239. *yppe Ap.* 64, *El.* 435.

b. *hige onhyrded þurh his hálig word Ap.* 53, *cf. hige onhyrded þurh þæt hálige trêo El.* 841.
hwæt! wé þæt (*ge*)*hýrdon þurh* (*þurg*). *hálige bêc Ap.* 63, *El.* 364, 670, 852.
miht and mærðo Ap. 7, *cf. mærðum and mihtum El.* 15.
neawe searwe Ap. 13, *cf. nearusearwe El.* 1109.
on galgan áhangen Ap. 40-1, *El.* 179-80.
on weres háde Ap. 27, *El.* 72.
þurh hálige bêc Ap. 63, *El.* 364, 670, 853.
wíges tó léane Ap. 74, *cf. wigges léan El.* 825.

2.

a. *hlyt Ap.* 9, *El.* 821 (*cf. An.*).

b. *hęriges byrhtme* (*brehtme, beorhtme*) *Ap.* 21, *El.* 205 (*cf. An.*).
hwæt! wé þæt (*ge*) *hýrdon* . . . . *Ap.* 63, *El.* 670, 852 (*cf. Jul.*).
síðes sáne Ap. 34, *cf. síðfætes sáne El.* 220 (*cf. An.*).
þurh yrne (*eorne*) *hyge Ap.* 68, *El.* 685 (*cf. Chr.*).

3.

a. *ǽgélaw Ap.* 24, *El.* 321, 806 (*cf. An. and Men.*).
beaduréf Ap. 78, *El.* 152, 1004, 1185 (*cf. An. and B.*).
beþurfan Ap. 91, *El.* 543 (*cf. Jul. and Hy.*)

b. *dryhtnes ǽ Ap.* 10, *El.* 198, 971 (*cf. An. and Jul.*).

4.

b. *æt sæcce Ap.* 59, *El.* 1178, 1183 (*cf. B., Brun., and Jud.*)
for æf(*e*)*stum Ap.* 73, *El.* 496 (*cf. Gen., Gu., and Moods.*).

JULIANA.

1.

a. *hygeblind Ap.* 46, *Jul.* 61.

b. *héafde benéotan Ap.* 46, *Jul.* 604.
næs (*wæs*) . . . *læt* (rhythmical type xx ⌐|x ⌐) *Ap.* 33, *Jul.* 573, 712.
léohtes geléafan Ap. 66, *Jul.* 378, *cf. El.* 491, 1137, *Gu.* 624, 1084, *Jul.* 653, *Met.* 526, *Ph.* 479. *Sat.* 469.

2.

a. *háðengild Ap.* 47, *Jul.* 15, 22 (*cf. An.*).

b. *beorhtne boldwelan Ap.* 33, *Jul.* 503 (*cf. An.*)
eorðan sóhte (*sécan, etc.*) *Ap.* 28, *Jul.* 293 (*cf. An.*).
hwæt! wé þæt (*ge*) *hýrdon* . . . *Ap.* 63, *Jul.* 1, (*cf. El.*)

3.

a. *beþurfan*(*bi-*) *Ap.* 91, *Jul.* 715 (*cf. El. and Hy.*)
wundorcræfte Ap. 55, *Jul.* 575 (*cf. An. and Rid.*)

b. *dryhtnes ǽ Ap.* 10, *Jul.* 13, (*cf. An. and El.*)
síðe gesóhte Ap. 32, *Jul.* 452 (*cf. An. and B.*)

VERBAL CORRESPONDENCES WITH DOUBTFUL CYNEWULFIAN POEMS.

DREAM OF THE ROOD.

3.

b. *lifes weg Ap.* 31, *Rood* 88 (*cf. An. and Gu.*)

GUTHLAC.

1.

a. *éhtwela Ap.* 84, *Gu.* 359.

b. *eorðan dǽl Ap.* 94. *Gu.* 1340.
on séocum sefan Ap. 2, *cf. on sefan tó séoc Gu.* 1050.

2.

b. *þone sóðan geféan Ap.* 81, *cf. þám sóðan geféan Gu.* 1238 (*cf. Chr.*)

3.

b. *lifes weg Ap.* 31, *Gu.* 70 (*cf. An. and Rood.*)

4.

b. *for æf*(*e*)*stum Ap.* 73, *Gu.* 684 (*cf. El., Gen., and Moods.*)

PHŒNIX.

2.

a. *eardwic Ap.* 93, *Ph.* 431 (*cf. Part.*)
beaducræftig (*beado-*) *Ap.* 44, *Ph.* 286 (*cf. G. M.*).
wælréaf Ap. 95, *Ph.* 273 (*cf. B.*).

b. *ǣn(i)ges on eorðan Ap.* 19, *Ph.* 136(*cf. Chr.*).

RIDDLES.

1.

a. *fégan Ap.* 98, *cf. Rid.* 26^{9}, 62^{6}.

2.

b. *weorc þrówigan* (*þrówade*) *Ap.* 80, *Rid.* 71^{12} (*cf. B.*).

3.

a. *wundorcræfte Ap.* 55, *Rid.* 41^{85} (*cf. An. and Jul.*).

D.—Verbal Correspondences with Other Poems.

BEOWULF.

1.

ęllen cýðdon Ap. 3, *cf. ęllen cýðan B.* 2695.
frame (*frǫme*) *fyrdhwate Ap.* 12, *B.* 1641, 2476, *cf. An.* 8.

b. *him . . . bám samod Ap.* 78, *B.* 2196.
hú þá æðelingas ęllen . . . . Ap. 3, *B.* 3.
líf wið lice Ap. 83, *B.* 733, *cf. Chr.* 1668.
sigores tó léane Ap. 62, *B.* 1021.
wide sprang Ap. 6, *B.* 18.

2.

a. *wælréaf Ap.* 95, *B.* 1205 (*cf. Ph.*).

b. *sweordrǽs fornam Ap.* 59, *cf. heaðorǽs fornam B.* 557 (*cf. An.*).
þéodnes þegna Ap. 8, *cf. þéodnes þegne B.* 1085 (*cf. An.*).
weorc þrówigan (*þrówade*) *Ap.* 80, *B.* 1721 (*cf. Rid.*).

3.

beaduróf Ap. 78, *B.* 3161 (*cf. An. and El.*).

a. *ęndedæg Ap.* 79, *B.* 637, 3035 (*cf. Dan. and Hy.*).
lystan Ap. 97, *B.* 1793 (*cf. Met. and Whale*).

b. *síðe gesóhte Ap.* 32, *B.* 1951 (*cf. An. and Jul.*).

b. *æt sæcce Ap.* 59, *B.* 953, 1618, 2612, 2659, 2681 (*cf. Brun., El., and Jud.*).

BRUNANBURH.

4.

b. *æt sæcce Ap.* 59, *Brun.* 4,42 (*cf. B., El., and Jud.*).

BYRHTNOTH'S DEATH.

3.

a *gúðplega Ap.* 22, *By.* 61 (*cf. An. and Chr.*).

DANIEL.

1.

a. *wig weorðian* (*wurðígean*) *Ap.* 48, *Dan.* 208.

2.

a. *lífwela Ap.* 49, *Dan.* 56 (*cf. Chr.*).

b. *dryhtne gecoren(e) Ap.* 5, *Dan.* 150, 737 (*cf. Gen.*).

3.

a. *ęndedæg Ap.* 79, *Dan.* 679 (*cf. B. and Hy.*)

EXODUS.

1.

b. *hálgan héape Ap.* 9, *þone hálgan héap Ap.* 90, *cf. hálige héapas Ex.* 382, 568.

GENESIS.

1.

a. *tilmódig Ap.* 86, *Gen.* 1887, 2817.

b. *léófe on lífe Ap.* 6, *cf. léoflic on lífe Gen.* 1713.

2.

b. dryhtne gecoren(e) Ap. 5, *Gen.* 1818 (*cf. Dan.*).

4.

b. *for æf(e)stum Ap.* 73, *Gen.* 982 (*cf El., Gu., and Moods.*).

GIFTS OF MEN.

b. *beaducræftig(beado-) beorn Ap.* 44, *G. M.* 40.

2.

a. *beaducræftig(beado-) Ap.* 44, *G. M.* 40 (*cf. Ph.*).

HYMNS.

3.

a. *beþurfan* (*bi-*) *Ap.* 91, *Hy.* 7^{113} (*cf. El. and Jul.*).
ęndedæg Ap. 79, *Hy.* 7^{112} (*cf. B. and Dan.*)

b. *ęngla ordfruma Ap.* 28, *Hy.* 10^{6} (*cf. An. and Sat.*).

JUDITH.

2.

b. *swegle dréamas Ap.* 32, *cf. swegles dréamas Jud.* 350 (*cf. An.*).

3.

b. *ealle ðráge Ap.* 30, *Jud.* 237 (*cf. Ps. and Wid.*).

4.

b. *æt sæcce Ap.* 59, *Jud.* 289 (*cf. B., El., and Brun.*).

MENOLOGIUM.

3.

a. *ðglêaw Ap.* 24, *Men.* 19 (*cf. An. and El.*).

METRA.

2.

a. *fitte Ap.* 98, *Met. Int.* 9 (*cf. Whale*).

3.

a. *lystan Ap.* 97, *Met.* 9^{19}, 10^{1}, 10^{14}, 10^{18}, 19^{11}, ^{16}, ^{33}, ^{39}, ^{26}, ^{71}, 31^{1} (*cf. B. and Whale.*).

MOODS OF MEN.

4.

a. *for æf(e)stum Ap.* 73, *Moods* 37 (*cf. El., Gen., and Gu.*).

PARTRIDGE.

1.

b. *torhte and tirêadige Ap.* 4, *cf. torhte tirêadge Part.* 10.

2.

a. *eardwic Ap.* 93, *Part.* 15 (*cf. Ph.*).

PSALMS.

2.

b. *ofer werþêoda Ap.* 15, *Ps.* 104^{6} (*cf. An.*).

3.

b. *ealle ðrâge Ap.* 30, *Ps.* 101^{25} (*cf. Jud. and Wid.*).

helpe bidde (*biddan, etc.*) *Ap.* 90, *Ps.* 118^{2} (*cf. An. and Ps. L.*).

PSALM L.

3.

b. *helpe bidde* (*biddan, etc.*) *Ap.* 90, *Ps. L.* 50 (*cf. An. and Ps.*).

SATAN.

1.

b. *wuldres lêoht Ap.* 61, *Sat.* 42, 141, 253, 449, 617, 650.

2.

b. *fæder mancynnes Ap.* 29, *Sat.* 310 (*cf. An.*).

3.

b. *engla ordfruma Ap.* 28, *Sat.* 239, 659 (*cf. An. and Hy.*).

WHALE.

2.

a. *fitte Ap*, 98, *Whale* 1 (*cf. Met.*).

3.

a. *lystan Ap.* 97, *Whale* 52 (*cf. B. and Met.*).

WIDSITH.

3.

b. *ealle ðrâge Ap.* 30, *Wid.* 88 (*cf. Jud. and Ps.*)

ALBERT S. COOK.

University of California.

MODERN PICARD BIEU FROM BELLUM.

There can be no doubt about the correctness of the explanation concerning the origin of Modern French *beau* given by FÖRSTER in *Zeitsch. für rom. Phil.* i, pp. 564 ff. He there derives *beau* from *bels* through the intermediate stages *bêals* > *beâls* > *beau(s)*. Numerous examples cited by him from the earlier texts prove conclusively that this was the history of the form. *Bials* > *biaus* was a later development from *beâls*, and FÖRSTER admits (p. 567) that he should prefer this explanation for all the Old French dialects, but for the fact that the Modern Picard, besides the ending *-iau*, shows also the ending *-ieu*; he adds therefore, "das pik. *biau* lässt eine doppelte Erklärung zu; entweder mit wallonischer Diphthongirung *biels* (und vokalisirt *bieus*), und durch Einfluss des *l* daraus *bials* und mit vokalisirtem *l* endlich *biaus*; diese Form gab dem heutigen pikard. *biau*, jenes dem *bieu* seinen Ursprung; ..... Diese Entwickelung möchte ich aber gern auf das *Wallonische* beschränken, denn dafür ist die oben von DIEZ gegebene Reihe (BELLUM > *bel* > *biel* > *bial* > *biau*; DIEZ, 'Gram.' 1^{3} p. 437) tadellos." From these statements it appears that FÖRSTER maintains the following points: (1) in the *Wallonian* dialect *bels* changed to *biels* > *bials* > *biaus*; (2) that the modern Picard form *bieu* must be derived from a preceding *biels*; (3) in all the dialects (except that of Lorraine, where the vowel of the termination -ELLUS did not change, and a small part of the Picard territory) *-els* changed to *-êals* > *eâls* (> *-eaus*) > *-ials* > *-iaus*. I wish to offer a few observations on these three points, and, following FÖRSTER's example, I shall in illustration use as far as possible the vulg. Lat. BELLUS, since all the words with the ending -ELLUS (or -ELLUM) follow the same line of development. Let us consider these different points separately and in the order given.

In the earliest Wallonian monument, the 'Poème Moral,' published by CLOETTA in *Rom. Forsch.* iii, pp. 1–268, (which represents the Liége dialect in the beginning of the thirteenth century, l. c., p. 2), we find for -EL+ cons. always *ea*+cons., cf. *beaz* 394 d, 399 b;

jovenceaz 122 a; *agnieaz* 71 c (*-gni-* probably= *ñ*) *bealteit* 440 a; etc., etc. This condition of things had not changed a hundred years later, as is seen in the 'Poésies religieuses en dialecte liégeois' (ed. P. MEYER, *Rev. d. Soc. sav.* Série V, vol. vi, pp. 241 ff.). Here *-els* is found as *-eas*, cf. *beas.* ii, 13; *columbeas* iii, 13; *chastias* v, 7; *-el* is often still *-el* as in the 'Poème Moral,' but also by the same kind of analogy which produced Mod. Fr. *beau*, it is changed to *-ea*, as in *bea* v, 17, 24; vii, 1; *columbeal* iii, 13; *angeal* or *anheal* iii, 14; From these two monuments we can with sufficient definiteness conclude in what way *-els* developed. There was a change of *ę* in the usual way to *ea*, and the *l*, following the peculiar tendency of this dialect, fell, at a period as early as the beginning of the thirteenth century. The modern dialect of Liége has for this ending -ELLUS a sound wavering between *ę* and *ę*. Cf. HORNING, 'Zur Kunde des Neuwallonischen,' *Zs. f. r. Ph.* ix, p. 483. PROF. STÜRZINGER of Bryn Mawr kindly informs me that he has heard this sound (*ę*) everywhere in the eastern region of this dialect (Bartogne, Malmédy, Verviers, Liége, Jemelle) as far as Huy, halfway between Liége and Namur. From there westward to about halfway between Charleroy and Mons the pronunciation is *iá*, then *iọ* (written *iau* or *ieau*). I believe that the commonly accepted explanation of this modern Wallonian *ę* (*ę*) from old Wallonian *ea* is the correct one, viz., that the two elements of *ea* gradually assimilated, and thus produced a sound wavering between *ę* and *ę*. From these data I think it can be reasonably concluded that the series *bels* > *biels* > *bials* > *biau* does not belong to the Wallonian proper. But these statements need some limitation. FÖRSTER gives us no clue as to which monuments in his opinion belong to the Wallonian dialect; but since immediately afterwards (p. 567) he uses the phrase "der übrige Theil des Pikardischen," one is tempted to believe that he considers the Wallonian as a part of the Picard. It would therefore seem that he here employs the old division of North French dialects, which is still adhered to by some Romance scholars. According to this system, the Wallonian is considered to be a species of the Picard. A more characteristic division is given by SUCHIER in GRÖBER'S *Zeitschrift* ii, pp. 255 ff. He distinguishes (p. 275) to the north of the Norman, Île de France, Champagne and Lorraine dialects two distinct groups: the Picard in the west, the Wallonian in the east; and in GRÖBER'S 'Grundriss' i, p. 602 ff., and on Map I. of the same volume, this division is still maintained by him. One would of course hardly expect that a dialect of such great latitude as the Wallonian (cf. the map, l. c.) should present a homogeneous development throughout the whole extent of its territory. On account of this diversity of phonetic phenomena, the western part of the Wallonian has been variously ascribed either to the Picard or to the Wallonian, according as one or another of the different phenomena was considered as of special importance. By some scholars the dividing line between Picard and Wallonian is placed east of Mons and Valenciennes. However that may be, the Wallonian is divided into two parts by its development of *l*. The Eastern half follows the law of the eastern dialects and drops the *l*, the western half vocalizes *l* to *u*. With a collection of more or less satisfactory material (which it is not to the point to designate here) I think I have been able to establish the dividing line between the eastern and western dialects, as follows: Draw a line, starting from Langres (Dép. de Haute Marne), going north and touching Possesse, Ménéhoud, Rilly aux Oies, passing east of Révin and running through *Huy*. East of this line *l* falls; on the west, *l* changes to *u*. No absolute correctness can be claimed for this line, but I believe that it will be found to follow very nearly the actual boundary. In saying, therefore, that *-els* > *-iels* does not belong to the Wallonian, I mean only its eastern half; in the western half the development of -ELLUS is the same as in Picard and must be treated with it.

We come now to the second point, viz: Does Modern Picard *bieu* come from an older *biels*? There are few combinations of sounds that appear in O. Fr. under such a variety of orthography. For *-els* I have found no less than eight different ways of writing, not counting the forms without *s* and the feminines. Now, if *biau* is derived from an older *biels*, it

is at least reasonable to expect that the ending *-iels* would be found somewhere; but up to the present I have searched in vain for a form *biels* or the like. I am unable to state accurately the territory where *-ieu* is found in modern Picard. According to the 'Évangile selon Saint Mathieu,' (translated by E. PARIS, London, 1863), *-ieu* exists in Amiens, but from other indications that I have found, I should suppose that its territory is not very extended. CORBLET, 'Glossaire du Patois Picard,' says (p. 131): "*-eau* = *ieu* and *iau*; *chatiau* and *bieu*;" and in the vocabulary he gives both endings for nearly all the words in question. In SCHNACKENBURG'S 'Idiomes ou Patois de la France' (Berlin, 1840), p. 265, I find *biau* (2) *biel*, and (p. 267) *bieu*. The same appears from FAVRE 'Enfant prodigue.' I give the examples belonging here: Mons (p. 12): *anniau*, *viau*; Cambray (p. 13): *inniau viaus*; Arras (p. 15): *annieau*, *vieau*; Carvin (p. 17): *ongniau*, *viau*; St. Omer (p. 19): *aniau viau*.* Let us examine briefly the older stages of this dialect. A monument in which the diphthongisation of *ę* to *ie*, both in open syllable and in position, is carried out to its fullest extent is the 'Chronique' of PHILIPPE MOUSQUES, written very likely at Tournay in the first half of the thirteenth century (cf. edition of REIFFENBERG vol. i; Supplément, p. 8). Here *-els* is represented everywhere by *-iaus*; *-el*, as well as *-ele*, is always written *-iel*, *-iele*. The older *e* is found recorded a few times, as in *bele* 15328, *kamel* 22881, (*kameul* 1244), *bel* 29369, *elme* 6051, *castel* 20048, and a very few others. Forms like *biel* 36, *biele* 50, *vaissiel* 447, etc., abound, and represent the regular development. On the other hand, *-els* equals *-iaus* as a rule; *biaus* 532, *hiaume* 1763, *castiaus* 6242. Exceptional forms are *eaumes* 8790 (a remnant of the older stage?), and *castius* 27030, for regular *castiaus*. It is to be noticed how strictly the nom. sg. and acc. pl. are separated from the acc. sg. and nom. pl. The declension of *oiseau*, for instance, appears as follows: nom. sg. *oisiaus* 6475, acc. sg. *oisiel* 10386, nom. pl. *oissiel* 13296, acc. pl. *oiziaus* 2402. A similar state of affairs is found in the other monuments. Where *e* does not diphthongize, we have: sg. *-iaus*, *-el*; pl. *-el*, *-iaus*, and sometimes, in accordance with regular Picard development, *-iaus* is reduced to *-ias*. This holds true (so far as I have been able to find) for all the territory west of Valenciennes; cf. 'Les Trouvères belges du XIIe au XIIIe siècle, ed. SCHELER, (Bruxelles 1876). It is found also in 'AUC. NIC.,' 'Rich. li Biaus' (which shows the same forms as the 'Chronique'), 'Miserere' of the 'Renclus de Moiliens,' 'Dis dou vray Aniel,' and in the selections from JEHAN DE CONDÉ, ADANS DE LA HALLE, ADENET LE ROI, found in BARTSCH, 'Chrest. franç.' Nowhere have I been able to find the ending *-iels*. Sometimes irregular case-forms occur, of which I here note the following: from the 'Trouvères belges,' JOCELIN DE BRUGES (pp. 154-162), *aignels* i, 28, acc. pl.; *novels* i, 32., acc. pl.; *avels* (lat. SAPILLUS, cf. DIEZ, E. W., s. v.) i, 36, acc. pl.; *juels* i, 38, acc. pl. GILLEBERT DE BERNEVILLE (pp. 52–128): *dansel* viii, 27, nom. sg.; *biau* xiii, 7, 9, xix, 21, xx, 7, acc. sg.; *chapiau* xxiv, 36, acc. sg.; *beau* xxxii, 11) nom. sg.; DUC DE BRABANT (pp. 41-52): *noviau* iii, 4, acc. sg.; *biau* iii, 13, 37, n. sg.; 'Combat de Saint Pol contre les Cormois' (pp. 242–267): *biau* 37, acc. sg. for regular *biel*. From the foregoing it appears that the following considerations militate against the explanation of *bieu* from *biels*, viz.: (1) only *bel* (not *bels*) changed to *biel*; (2) the older Picard form is *biaus*; (3) *biels* does not seem to exist. Let it be noted at this point that LÜCKING has placed the impossible form *anielz* in v. 39 d, of his reconstructed text of the "Passion" ('Mundarten,' p. 53). To say nothing of the appearance of *z* for *s* after *l* in this dialect (Burgundian, as he supposes), we have the irregular change of *ę to ie* in this position. In Burgundian *-els* = *-eals*; cf. FÖRSTER 'Lyoner Yzopet,' p. xxx, § 26.

In *Johns Hopkins Univ. Circulars* vol. vi, p. 120, I hazarded an explanation based upon such irregular acc. pl. forms as *aignels*, *avels*, *juels*, by the side of regular *agniaus*, etc., cited above. In those dialects where the nom. pl. and acc. sg. ended in *-iel*, as in PHILIPPE MOUSQUES, the *s* in like manner was added to the acc. sg. to form a new acc.

*According to JORET, 'Patois Normand,' p. 112, *-ieu* is found in some parts of the cantons of Gournay, Forges and Aumale, instead of the regular Norman ending *io*.

pl.; e. g., *oisiel* acc. sg. gave *oisiel+s* acc. pl. and likewise *oisiel* nom. pl. was changed to *oisiel+s*. This new plural once formed, the *l* vocalized regularly, and *oisiels* gave *oisieus*; from this the new singular *oisieu* was formed. There could be no objection to this explanation if a word ending in *-iels* were found. This plural form might be expected to occur in Picard texts of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, but no such texts are at my disposal. Till the existence of the ending *-iels* is proved, any attempt to derive *bieu* from *biels* must always be viewed with some doubt.

Another explanation is still possible. We might suppose that the acc. sg. and nom. pl. *-iel* vocalized its *l* in accordance with the principle of "Satzphonetick" when standing before a word beginning with a consonant, but kept it unchanged when preceding a word beginning with a vowel. So that *-iel*$^{\text{cons.}}$ gave *ieu*; *-iel*$^{\text{vow.}}$ remained *-iel*. In the course of time *-ieu* gained the upper hand over *-iel*, and from it was formed a new plural *-ieus*. It seems impossible to decide which is the correct explanation.

If my position is well taken, the theory of FÖRSTER, that in a part of the Picard territory *bels* passed through the stages *biels* > *bials*, falls of itself. If Picard *biaus* comes from *biels*, we have two stages of development represented in such texts as the 'Chronique' of PHILIPPE MOUSQUES, and it is difficult to understand why *biels* should have changed to *bials*, while *biel* remained. In my opinion, *wherever -iaus* is found as the regular form, -ELLOS passed through *-els*, *-éals*, *-eáls* > *ials*. The interchange of -ELLOS, -ILLOS and -ALIS in some texts presents phenomena upon which I do not wish to enter here.

In closing, I wish to make a remark on the difference in the history of *bel* and *bels*. In both words we start with the most open *e* =(*ę*), cf. KOSCHWITZ, 'Ueberl. und Sprache,' p. 24. The *l* was guttural (i. e. an *l* in *u* position), and between this *ę* and *l* an *a*-glide developed, cf. ULBRICH, *Zs. f. r. Ph.* ii, p. 538. The reason for the difference of development is as follows: In *bęls* the greater stress rests upon the *s*; the *l*, being rapidly passed over, tended to vocalize, and this slurring of the *l* gave the *a*-glide a chance to develop. On the other hand, in *bęl* the stress rests on the fully pronounced *l*, and therefore the glide did not develop, though no doubt it existed there in germ as well as in *-ęls*. In the course of time *ę* changed to *ę*, and as such it remained. The glide from *ę* to *l* is, however, more of an *o* than anything else. An analogous case is the feminine *belle*, where no doubt the same glide existed, but where it did not become prominent for the same reasons. It seems to me that in *beolle* cited by SUCHIER, 'Auc. Nic.,' p. 53, from the 'Geste de Liége,' 37521–2, the *o* performs the same function as *a* in *beals*. In those dialects where *ę* later diphthongized to *ie*, this *ę* followed the same law. According to TEN BRINK, 'Klang und Dauer' (p. 18, note, and p. 47) this change took place in the last third of the twelfth and the beginning of the thirteenth century, and hence the forms *biel* and *biele* in the text cited above.

JOHN E. MATZKE.

Baltimore, Md.

MOHAMED IN DER ANSCHAUUNG DES MITTELALTERS.—I.

Nichts lässt das eigentliche Wesen und den Character der mittelalterlichen Menschheit deutlicher zu Tage treten, als die Betrachtung darüber, wie andere Epochen und Culturformen von ihr aufgenommen oder widergespiegelt worden sind. Betrachten wir nur die mittelalterliche Cultur und Litteratur nach *dem*, was neu in ihr geschaffen wurde, so verleiten uns die namentlich dem Europäer oft nicht deutlich genug ins Auge springenden Eigenthümlichkeiten, sowie die vielen Ähnlichkeiten, die mittelalterliche und moderne Culturformen noch immer besitzen, zu dem Fehler, dass wir mittelalterliche Cultur-und Kunstformen mit dem modernen Maassstabe abmessen. Man dringt um so tiefer in die Kenntniss des sogenannten mittelalterlichen Geistes ein, je mehr man die einheimischen wie die fremden Elemente gesonderter Betrachtung unterzieht. Untersuchungen in dieser Richtung sind gewiss schon angestellt, aber noch keine in wirklich bewusster Absicht. Die Zeit der Romantiker war zu derartigen Studien zu wenig vorurtheilsfrei, die modernere Zeit, die nach der Zertrümmerung des

Prunkbaues Hegelscher Philosophie der Geschichtsphilosophie überhaupt den Todtenschein auszustellen sich berechtigt glaubte, verfiel dem öden Evolutionismus, der dem Einzelforscher keinerlei sichere Führung auf seinen mühseligen Pfaden bietet. Vielleicht ist es kein Zufall, dass in demselben Lande, wo die beiden trefflichen Arbeiten über Rom und über Vergil in der Anschauung des Mittelalters verfasst wurden,—von A. GRAF und von D'ANCONA—auch der Anfang gemacht worden ist, eine gesunde Geschichtsphilosophie wieder zu Ehren zu bringen, die für uns Litterarhistoriker ganz in demselben Maasse beachtenswerth oder bindend ist, wie für den politischen Historiker. Ich meine ANTONIO LABRIOLAS neuste Schrift: 'Problemi della filosofia della storia,' die ich durch eine deutsche Bearbeitung meinen Landsleuten näher zu bringen für nöthig hielt.

Wir bewegen uns diesmal auf gleicher Linie wie ARTURO GRAF und D'ANCONA. Es bedürfte einmal einer umfassenden Untersuchung über die Rolle, die der Orient im christlichen Mittelalter gespielt hat, über die nachweisbaren Einflüsse orientalischer Litteratur auf die abendländische, wozu es—ich will nur an Männer wie BENFEY, JOURDAIN, WÜSTENFELD erinnern—nicht an verständigen Vorarbeiten fehlt, über das, was das Mittelalter dem Oriente verdankt, worüber bis jetzt mehr phantasirt, als geforscht ist, sowie endlich darüber, was das Mittelalter vom Orient wusste und glaubte. In letzterer Beziehung mögen die trefflichen Studien ZARNCKES über das Lebermeer als mustergültige genannt werden.

Auf unserem rein litterarhistorischen Gebiete muss man den Stoff in zwei Theile zergliedern. Der Orient, wenn wir den Begriff nun einmal im weitesten Sinne nehmen wollen, war, namentlich seit dem ersten Kreuzzuge, dem Abendlande bis zu einer gewissen Grenze gut bekannt. Man bezeichnet die Grenze damit am leichtesten, dass man sagt, sie beginnt dort, wo die Itinerarien der Pilger endigen. Somit schliesst sie ein Stück von Unterägypten ein—Kairo, das man in Geschichte und Dichtung Babylon nannte, kannte man höchstens dem Namen nach—und umfasst das ganze Palestina bis hin zur Wüste. Innerhalb dieses Districtes hatte die Fabelwelt keinen Platz, erst spätere französische Epiker konnten es wagen, hier z. B. die Sagen vom Alten vom Berge spielen zu lassen, die sich indessen wenig von dem entfernte, was wirkliche oder vermeintliche Wahrheit war. Aber jenseits dieser Grenze konnte der tollste Spuk sein Wesen treiben. Der gelehrte JACOB VON VITRY, Bischof von Accon (vgl. dessen 'Historia Hierosolymitana' bei BONGARS, 'Gesta Dei per Francos,' p. 1047–1145) giebt über Land und Leute von Palestina die aller sicherste Auskunft, seine Beschreibung des Beduinenlebens ist ein Muster von Treue, aber sobald er die angedeutete Grenze in seinen Schilderungen übertritt, nimmt er selbst die unglaublichsten Fabeln seiner Vorgänger kritiklos auf. Jeder andere mittelalterliche Schriftsteller, der über den Orient handelt, giebt zu den gleichen Bemerkungen Anlass.

Um nicht zu lange bei den Vorbemerkungen zu bleiben, wollen wir sogleich die beiden poetischen Behandlungen, die der Legende von MOHAMED im Mittelalter zu Theil wurde, dem Leser kurz vorführen, um sie zum Ausgangspuncte unserer Untersuchungen zu machen.[1]

Zuerst behandelte der berühmte HILDEBERT von Tours, gestorben 1139, in poetischer Form die sagenhafte Geschichte von MOHAMED in einem aus 1142 Versen (leoninischen Distichen) bestehenden lateinischen Gedichte mit dem Titel: 'Historia Hildeberti Cynomanensis episcopi de Mahumete' (vgl. die Ausgabe von BEAUGENDRE, Paris 1708, col. 1277–96).

Eine ganz fanatisch-christliche Tendenz spricht aus jeder Zeile des Gedichtes. In einem Prologe verwünscht der Verfasser die Ungläubigen, deren Gefährlichster MOHAMED ist. Wir werden öfter zu bemerken Gelegenheit haben, dass man MOHAMEDS Religion nur für eine christliche Ketzerei ansah, das man nämlich die von Mekka ausgehende neue Lehre mit den sonstigen *christlichen* Sekten-

1 Es muss hier auf die Einleitung zu ZIOLECKI'S Ausgabe des 'Roman de Mahomet' (Oppeln 1887) hingewiesen werden. Gegen die Bestimmtheit, mit dér daselbst die zum grossen Theile aus DU MÉRILS (s. u.) Anmerkungen herübergenommenen Angaben ausgesprochen werden, muss entschieden protestirt werden.

bildungen im Oriente zusammen brachte.[2] Auf Bitten eines GODEBALD will HILDEBERT erzählen, worin MOHAMEDS Verbrechen bestanden.

Es ist sehr merkwürdig, geht aber aus dem ganzen Gedichte hervor, dass HILDEBERT die *Geschichte* berichten will. Er erlaubt sich, epische Züge hinzuzuthun, die Schilderungen mit den Hülfsmitteln des Dramatikers lebendig zu gestalten, im Ganzen will er aber ebenso wahrheitsgetreu vorgehen, wie etwa der Dichter des 'Heliand' oder des althochdeutschen 'Ludwigsliedes.' Er beginnt mit der Beschreibung eines heuchlerischen Mannes.

Nam male devotus quidam Baptismate lotus
Plenus perfidia vixit in Ecclesia.

In Jerusalem will dieser eine hohe Ehrenstelle haben—'Praesul' werden—THEODOSIUS jedoch, von dem gesagt wird:

Tunc Rex invictus THEODOSIUS et benedictus,
Hostis perfidiae, filius Ecclesiae.
Summus erat Regum, sub quo sacra sanctio legum
Praedicante pio floruit AMBROSIO . . .

erkennt ihn als Heuchler und verjagt ihn. Nun wendet sich derselbe, den HILDEBERT auch, *magus* benennt, nach Lybien.

In Lybicum cursus detorquet ut impius ursus,
Et tunc in Lybia floruit ecclesia.
Affrica florebat, et Christo vota ferebat;
Sed bene quem coluit, heu! cito deseruit.
Nam modo praedicta veniens Magus urbe relicta
Hanc quoque rite piam saevit in ecclesiam.

Hierselbst treibt er sein heuchlerisches Spiel weiter und wohnt im Hause eines Consuls, der einen Hausverwalter mit Namen Mamutius hat. Diesen letzteren will der Magus zum Consul machen, zu welchem Zwecke er seinen Wohlthäter ermordet. Mamutius heiratet die Gemahlin des Verstorbenen, deren Name ungenannt bleibt, und wird selbst Consul. Der Magus, weiteres Unheil planend, füttert ein weisses Kalb unter der Erde ohne Licht auf, das in Folge dessen zu einem missgestaltenen Unthiere aufwächst.

Inzwischen ist der fromme König von Lybien gestorben. Er hat die Grabschrift erhalten:

Tres luctus causae sunt hoc sub marmore clausae
Rex decus ecclesiae summus honor patriae.

Eine grosse Versammlung tritt zusammen, um einen neuen König zu erwählen. Der Magus sendet seinen dienstfertigen Mamutius zu derselben, damit er sie veranlasse, den Magus um Rath zu befragen. Derselbe wird richtig eingeladen und hält eine heuchlerisch bescheidene Rede, die nach unserer Ansicht die best ausgeführte Stelle des ganzen Gedichtes ist. Der missgestaltete Stier kommt herbei, vor dem sich die ganze Versammlung entsetzt. Der Magus erklärt sofort, wer den Stier bändige, der solle König werden. Zuerst versucht ein Jüngling den Kampf, kommt aber dabei um. Sodann geht MOHAMED darauf zu, der Stier erkennt ihn und beleckt ihn freundlich.

Somit ist Mamutius König geworden, aber des Magus Pläne sind noch nicht zu Ende. Er soll sich auch zum Gotte machen lassen und vor Allem die Lehren des Evangeliums umstossen. Auch dazu erklärt sich MOHAMED bereit. Er stösst die Religion um und macht seine Begierden zum Gesetze. Dafür aber bestraft ihn Gott mit der Epilepsie. Um dieses Leiden zu verhüllen muss M. vorgeben —wie es ihm der Magus räth—in den Himmel entrückt zu sein. Der Magus bestätigt der Menge alle Einzelheiten und hält eine Lobrede auf das neue Gesetz. Bald darauf stirbt MOHAMED eines schrecklichen Todes:

Omnia torpebant, manus, os, pes, lingua rigebant;
Totus diriguit, totus iners jacuit.
Guttur praeclusum linguae vocis negat usum;
Stabant et vacua lumine luce sua.

Es kommen zuletzt sogar Schweine, die ihn anfressen.

Der letzte Gesang enthält die Beschreibung des Grabmals des Propheten: Alles ist phantastisch; doch wir müssen der Stelle, die vom "hängenden Sarge" handelt, genauere Beachtung widmen. Es heisst;

Sic opus elatum solo magnete paratum
In medio steterat quod velut arcus erat.
Sub quo portatur Mahumet, tumuloque locatur,
Qui si quis quaerat aere paratus erat.
Et quia revera tam grandia contrahit aera,
In qua Rex jacuit tumba levata fuit.

[2] Vgl. 'Alcoranus latinus' ed. BIBLIANDER, Apologia: Nam doctrina Nestorii flammis non deleta est, et Nestoriani sobolem produxerunt, ut post annos prope CC. Sergius Nestorianus Machumetem sua haeresi effinxerit aliqua ex parte.

Et sic pendebat, quod vis lapidum feciebat.
Ergo rudes populi prodigium tumuli
Postquam viderunt, rem pro signo timuerunt
Credentes miseri per Mahumet fieri.
Pendere res plena quod pendeat absque catena,
Nec sic pendiculum quod teneat tumulum . . .

Wir wollen uns vorläufig des näheren Commentars enthalten und sogleich auf den altfranzösischen 'Roman de Mahomet' des Näheren eingehen (vgl. d. Ausgg. von REINAUD und FRANCISQUE MICHEL, Paris 1831; und von ZIOLECKI, 1887).—Über den Verfasser des Gedichtes berichtet der Anfang:—

S'auchuns velt oir ou savoir
La vie Mahommet, a voir
En penra ichi connissanche.
En la terre le roi de Franche
Mest jadis à Sens en Bourgoigne,
Uns clers avoecques .j. chanoigne
Ki Sarrasins avoit este,
Mais prise avoit crestiiente;
Mahom del tout laissie avoit;
. . . . . .
Il fu clers quant il fut paiens,
Et clers apries fu crestiiens.
A son signour conta la guile
Ki à .j. abbe de la vile,
Lequel on apieloit Gravier,
Le conta, et chil à Gautier.
Ki moignes estoit de s'abbie.
Li moignes lues en versifie,
.J. libres en latin en fist,
U Alixandres dou Pont prist
La matere dont il a fait
Cest petit romanch et estrait.
Si com aferme li dis moignes,
Adans avoit nom li chanoignes,
Li clers avoit non Diu-dounes,
Pour chou c'a Diu estoit donnes,

Über Zeit und Ort der Abfassung giebt der Verfasser am Schlusse folgende Notiz:

Chi faut li romans de Mahon
Qui fu fais el mont de Loon
En l'an de l'Incarnation
Mil et. cc. cinkante et wit.

Somit wäre das altfranzösische Gedicht mehr als hundert Jahre jünger als das lateinische.—Der Inhalt ist folgender. MOHAMEDS Vater ist aus *Ydumee* ebenso wie seine Mutter, Der Vater heisst Audimenef, der Name der Mutter ist nicht bekannt. MOHAMED kennt die christliche Lehre und versteht die sieben freien Künste; er ist Diener bei einem "baron," dessen Reichthum mit folgenden Worten beschrieben wird:

Sers de son chief por voir estoit
A .j. baron cui il servoit,
Ki riches ert de grant maniere
De bos de pres et de riviere,
De vergiers, de molins, de fours,
De castiaus, de viles, de cours,
De chevaliers, de castelains,
De citoiens et de vilains.
Et ja soit chou k'il fust muebles
De vins, d'avainnes et de bles,
De deniers et d'or et d'argent . . .

Es zeigt schon diese Probe, wie wenig in derartigen mittelalterlichen Gedichten ctwa Localfarbe zu erwarten ist.

Der Held der Dichtung befrägt einen Einsiedler über sein Schicksal; derselbe weist ihn jedoch ab und verdammt ihn.—MOHAMED macht einen lohnenden Handelszug nach Indien, Persien und Aethiopien im Auftrage seines Herrn, welcher letztere bald darauf stirbt. MOHAMED vermählt sich mit der Witwe; die Hochzeit findet statt unter vielem Pomp. Zum grossen Entsetzen Aller bekommt aber MOHAMED bei dem Feste einen Anfall von Epilepsie. Er kommt wieder zu sich selber und entschuldigt seinen Fehler dadurch, dass er vorgiebt:—

Li angles sour moi descendi.

Seine Gattin, die vor Schreck geflohen war, sucht M. eiligst zu beruhigen. Er hält ihr einen längeren Vortrag über die neue Lehre, die ihm der Engel offenbart hat, und weist sie an, falls der Engel sich wiederum seiner bemächtigen sollte, ihn mit einer kostbaren Decke zu verhüllen, damit Niemand sein Geheimniss erführe. Er zieht sich ausserdem in eiuen Keller zurück, wo er nur Brod und Wein bie sich hat.

Bei Gelegenheit einer Versammlung der Adligen bei MOHAMED fangen die Frauen an, ihre Männer alle zu loben. Die Gattin MOHAMEDS ist auch auf den ihrigen stolz, lobt seine Fähigkeiten und plaudert schliesslich das Geheimniss aus. Deshalb muss jetzt MOHAMED offen auftreten und die verliehenen Gaben der Menge kund thun. Er beginnt mit einer Predigt auf einem Berge, der sich dann auch Wunderthaten anschliessen müssen.

Er lässt, wozu er vorher schon die Zurüstungen getroffen hat, Milch und Honig fliessen, er ruft zuletzt einen Ochsen herbei, der an seinen Hörnern angebunden das Gesetzbuch trägt.

Später werden die Anhänger der neuen Religion von den Persern angegriffen. Über die feindlichen Krieger sagt der Dichter:—

Mainte tre, mainte tente drechierent,
Et mainte ensaigne desploierent
Tainte de diverse nature,
Bieste i a de mainte figure.

Die Perser siegen in der Schlacht und MOHAMED stirbt bald. Hier folge noch die Beschreibung seines Grabes.

En la terre ne l'osent metre
.J. linsiel de fier forgier font,
La cors Mahom couchier i font;
Une maisonnete voltee
Tent d'aymant si compassee
K'en mi liu ont le cors laissie,
Ni a rien ne l'ont atachie,
En l'air sans nul loien se tient;
Mais li aimans le soustient,
Par sa nature seulement
De toute partie ingaument;
Nequedent n'i atouche mie
Sa gens, n'a talent ki l'otrie;
Ains dist que Mahons par miracle
Se soustient en son abitacle.

Wir bedauern, nicht weiter ins Einzelne gehen zu können, doch sind alle Hauptzüge des Gedichtes dargelegt.

Ganz eng schliesst sich nun das französische Gedicht an seine Vorlage an, die seit 1847 bekannt ist. Sie steht bei DU MÉRIL, 'Poésies populaires latines du moyen-âge,' p. 379–415. Es setzt der gelehrte Herausgeber als Zeit der Abfassung des Gedichtes die Mitte des zwölften Jahrhunderts an, welcher Annahme man unbedingt beistimmen muss. Das Gedicht beginnt so:

Quisquis nosse cupis patriam Machometis et actus
otia Walkrii de Machomete lege.
Sic tamen otia sunt ut et esse negotia credas,
Ne spernas quotiens otia forte legis
Nam si vera mihi dixit Warnerius abbas,
me quoque vera loqui de Machomete puta.

Nach ZIOLECKIS Untersuchung ist Alexandre dou Pont nur in zwei unwesentlichen Zügen seiner Vorlage gegenüber selbständig (v. 227–85 und v. 1916–51), so dass es einer besonderen Besprechung nicht bedarf. Eins ist allen diesen Dichtungen in hohem Grade gemeinsam: die Tendenz. MOHAMED ist der armselige und von der Epilepsie befallene Betrüger, der durch alle möglichen Gaukelwerke die Menschen bethört. Anders konnte man im Mittelalter den Begründer des Islâm nicht auffassen. Über seine Lehre wird garnichts gesagt, da sie ja eben nur aus Irrthum und Lüge besteht. Auf den bedeutsamsten Zug wiesen wir schon wiederholt hin: es fehlt, wie ja überhaupt im Mittelalter (vgl. Cynewulfs 'Elene'), jeder Localton. Fühlt man denn etwas Orientalisches durch, wenn man z. B. liest:—

Li baron demainnent grant joie,
Mantiaus et robes font de soie;
En haut font tendre les cortines,
Ou il a estoires devines
De la loi anciiennes pointes,
De maintes bonnes coulors taintes.

Diese Schilderungen sind kein Haar breit verschieden von denen, die wir etwa bei CHRESTIEN VON TROIES lesen!

RICHARD OTTO.

Munich.

STUDIES IN GOETHE'S FAUST.—I.

The publication of the oldest manuscript of GOETHE'S 'Faust' as it was found in the 'Nachlass' of FRL. VON GÖCHHAUSEN has in many respects revolutionized the study of our great poem. The question as to the real contents and form of the Faust fragment which GOETHE in 1775 brought with him to Weimar seems now to be finally settled, and many theories and conjectures of commentators have to be thrown overboard. Even SCHERER'S ingenious theory of an original *Prosa-Faust*, supported by so much philological acuteness, has proved to be only partly true in the face of the published facts. Still we must say in defence of SCHERER that the Göchhausen 'Faust' probably does not represent an exact copy of GOETHE'S own original manuscript. The lucky discoverer of the former, E. SCHMIDT, has expressed the sanguine belief that FRL. V. G. borrowed the poet's manuscript and leaving out mere incomplete sketches and unfinished parts had copied the principal finished scenes. The condition of the copy however does not

support this hypothesis. DÜNTZER, in an article in a recent number of the *Gegenwart*, called attention to he fact that GOETHE in 1781 presented to FRAU V. STEIN and HERZOGIN AMALIA a copy of his unpublished works which very probably contained also those scenes of Faust that he was willing to communicate. The probability of FRL. V. G. copying from the form revised by GOETHE for those ladies is therefore much greater, especially since we know how reluctant he was in allowing others to get hold of his unpublished manuscript.

Whatever the source of the present *Urfaust* may have been, new questions have arisen along with our knowledge of it, and new light is thrown upon the development of the poem as well as upon that of its composer. It is not the celebrated work of art, the revelation of the greatest poetical genius of modern times, which we meet in this oldest form. That part to which the poem owed its earliest fame, the philosophical scenes, are, with the exception of the first great monologue, not contained in it. Even the character of Mephisto appears quite undeveloped. In his rôle of an amusing clown and exceedingly diabolical companion, there is very little of the metaphysical representative of evil, "angekränkelt von des Gedankens Blässe." The young poet's chief interest is concentrated upon the development of the so-called "Gretchentragödie," to which seventeen of the twenty-one scenes in the *Urfaust* are devoted. This remarkable fact certainly demands explanation and necessitates a more careful study of the part in question than commentators have thus far bestowed upon it. With the publication of this oldest form of 'Faust' must have vanished even the last possible doubt of the fact that the poem in its original conception is the purest and most perfect outgrowth of the "Storm and Stress" period. All the effusions of nebulous philosophic criticism interpreting Faust as the representation of humanity, the "man *per se*," must be traced back to GOETHE'S own effort at metamorphosing the product of his youth into the the image of his mature age, with its depth of thought, its broad culture, and its manifold interest. Considering the *Urfaust* as a document of that peculiar "Geniezeit," it must seem remarkable that it was the ethical side of that great movement in the mental life of Germany which occupied GOETHE to such a great degree, and to which he gave such a masterly expression in the "Gretchentragödie." There are two great poetical ideas or "motifs" that stand forth in our *Urfaust*: on the one hand, the ardent desire of the genius for a new intuitive knowledge; and, on the other, the relation of the very same law defying unruly genius to follow the fixed, eternal laws of morals and the settled customs of society. The former we discover in the outbursts and outcries of the first monologue, in the subsequent appearance of the "Erdgeist," and in the scenes forming a contrast to the same idea; viz., "Faust und Wagner" and "Mephisto und der Schüler." The second idea; with all its tragic consequences, has been developed in the "Gretchentragödie."

But it is not our object here to consider the social and ethical tendencies of the "Genieperiode" in connection with all its other revolutionary efforts. The question with which the philologian will have to deal concerns the relation of the poet's work to its probable source, the influence of the latter upon the former, and the æsthetic and linguistic dependence of the poem on the material which the poet used. In the case of the "Gretchentragödie" we must ask, how far is it founded upon the Faust legend, how much of the poet's own experience does it contain, and are there any other sources which have determined its present formation? In other words, it will be our object to follow as closely as possible the poetic process in the soul of the poet, the product of which we have before us. I must here say a word in defense of the method which it is intended to pursue. Investigations of this kind have hitherto quite frequently been confined to the juxtaposition of such passages as by their linguistic and syntactic resemblance seem to admit of the conclusion that one of them has been derived from the other. This procedure quietly presupposes the poet to have worked according to the same principle of analogy that is at present applied with so much predelection and success in matters purely linguistic. It reduces the poetic process in the soul of the poet to a pro-

cess of conscious and calculative combinations which is supported neither by facts nor psychologic laws. What great poet has ever composed even the smallest poem by reading the works of his contemporaries or predecessors as stimulants, so to speak, in order then to combine from these his own product, and so cause his future philological interpreters to exult over their discovery of the constituent parts of that product?

There is no doubt that all poets are to a greater or less degree indebted to their predecessors and it is the task of philological inquiry to trace the influences so exerted. But in order that such investigations may arrive at the truth we must make clear the complex of æsthetic views which prevailed in the soul of the poet when he was under the ascendency of any given model. Investigations of this kind are important not only for the knowledge of the poet they treat of, but also for our knowledge of the laws of poetical production in general. They are of special interest and value for the philologian who investigates the language of a poet; for language is the material of the poet as an artist, and the individual use he makes of it, the syntatic constructions, the choice of words extending even to the smallest details, are determined to a great degree by his æsthetic views and practice.

In one of the later versions of the 'Faustbuch,' that of NIKOLAUS PFITZER (1674), we find an account according to which Faust falls in love with "eine schöne, doch arme Magd," who is employed as a servant by a grocer living in the vicinity of Faust, and who is unwilling to succumb to Faust's desires unless he marries her. It is unnecessary to say that this servant girl, the scanty account of whom GOETHE had probably never even seen cannot have been the model for his classical production. The attempt to trace the genealogy of GOETHE'S Gretchen to the Wittenberg servant girl has however been made, and it furnishes a striking illustration of the superficiality of prevailing methods, which I have before characterized as consisting mainly in a wrong application of the theory of evolution to objects that do not admit of such explanations. Since it is impossible to find the basis of the "Gretchentragödie" in the Faust legend itself, we must look for other sources: and here the poet's own experience suggests itself as the most natural source of his inspiration. Following the hint expressed by GOETHE in in the "Zueignung,"

> Gleich einer alten halbverklungnen Sage
> Kommt erste Lieb und Freundschaft mit herauf,

most of the interpreters of Faust have declared the Gretchen of 'Wahrheit und Dichtung' the prototype of Gretchen in Faust. But the question very properly arises for the careful reader of the account in 'W. u. D.': to what extent has this account been influenced by GOETHE'S intention to direct public opinion regarding the origin of his celebrated "Gretchentragödie?" With the exception of the name there is very little in the character of the Frankfort Gretchen and in the surroundings, the scenes in which she appears, that would justify the suppositions of the interpreters. It is far more probable that in the character of Gretchen GOETHE should have depicted some girl who had made a deep impression on him at the time when he conceived the drama of Faust; and there is none who would correspond to the ideal of pure, simple, innocent womanhood but Friederike von Sesenheim. A few writers on 'Faust' have already expressed a similar opinion, but owing to the difficulty of proving the correctness of this view, have never attempted to support it by sufficient reasons.

We should certainly be wrong in saying that Gretchen—who appears in all the surroundings of a "Bürgermädchen" of the sixteenth century—and Friederike are absolutely identical. We know that GOETHE'S relations to Friederike were in no respect similar to those of Faust to Gretchen, accompanied, as these were, by all their tragic consequences. While we may therefore safely say that the character of Gretchen in its chief features resembles that of Friederike as we know her not only from GOETHE'S description in 'W. u. D.' but also from poems and letters recently published, yet the course of events in Gretchen's sorrowful history is entirely unlike the life of Friederike. The æsthetic form of the course of events which constitutes the tragic fate of Gretchen must therefore necessarily be traced to other sources than that of GOETHE'S own

experience. According to the laws of imagination it is quite possible that the tragic Gretchen scenes are entirely due to GOETHE'S imaginative invention, by means of which he would have carried to an extreme what he had partially experienced in his own life. Besides, it is true that GOETHE, during his early Frankfort period, looked upon the events of Sesenheim as extremely tragic, and even his account of them in 'W. u. D.' does not justify the superficial talk of a Sesenheim idyl which we find in so many histories of literature.

The æsthetic process of transforming the character of Friederike into that of Gretchen was however assisted by influences which I think we are still able to follow. The time at which GOETHE conceived the idea of his Faust is not only the time of his relation to Friederike but also the time in which his æsthetic ideas concerning poetry underwent a radical revolution, and in which he attempted to form his own poetical productions according to his new ideas of poetry as well as according to the new poetic models which he had learned to admire. The "Gretchentragödie" especially was composed under the influence not only of these new æsthetic views but also of the poetic model from which those views were partly abstracted.

It is a fact generally known that GOETHE owed the revolution and reform of his æsthetic views concerning poety to HERDER. None of the biographers of either man has attempted, however, to represent in detail the gradual growth of these views, especially in GOETHE, who was destined to realize them in his poetry.

There is especially one essay of HERDER'S which contains the very essence of his æsthetic maxims at the time of his becoming acquainted with GOETHE, and which was published with an essay of the latter on mediæval architecture in 1773, in the little volume called 'Von deutscher Art und Kunst'? There cannot be any doubt as to the acquaintance of GOETHE with the chief ideas of this essay as early as his sojourn in Strasburg in 1771, for in his critical utterances of the year 1772, as we shall see later, we find his knowledge of HERDER'S views fully attested. The title of HERDER'S essay is: "Über Ossian und die Lieder alter Voelker." The fact that HERDER, like most of his contemporaries, fully believed in the authenticity of MCPHERSON'S 'Ossian' does not diminish the value of our essay. Here he appears as the most powerful advocate of a movement which had begun as early as the opening of the seventeenth century and which was destined to regenerate German poetry.

It is a happy thought from the outset, that he should choose from the starting point of his discussions on the nature of poetry the oldest lyrical productions of various nations. His unparalleled power of intuition thus led him to the discovery of the indisputable greater age of lyric poetry, which still contains in germ, as it were, the elements of the Epos and the Drama, and thus reveals the origin of all poetry when produced in its genuine purity. It was the time when discussions on the nature of poetry were exciting Germany and we can scarcely appreciate at the present time, the effect upon the younger generation of German poets of HERDER'S words declaring poetry to be "die Ausströmung der Liedenschaft, der Empfindung in Bildern." The feeling, the passion, which are revealed in popular songs we find most powerfully developed among the nations which HERDER calls "wilde Völker." As the faithful desciple of ROUSSEAU he declares that civilization has gradually destroyed in us the original, elementary power of passion.

By wilde Völker he does not however mean savage tribes, though he also points to the poetry of the North American Indians in order to sustain his definition of the nature of poetry. Since HERDER'S language defies translation I shall quote his own words, in which he explains himself more clearly on this point. 'Wissen Sie, dass je wilder d. i. je lebendiger, je freiwirkender ein Volk ist (mehr heisst dies Wort nicht), desto wilder d. i. desto lebendiger, freier, sinnlicher, lyrisch handelnder müssen auch, wenn es Lieder hat, seine Lieder sein! je entfernter von künstlicher, wissenschaftlicher Denkart, Sprache und Letternart das Volk ist, desto weniger müssen auch seine Lieder für's Papier gemacht und todte Letternverse sein; vom Lyrischen, vom Lebendigen und gleichsam Tanzmässigen des Gesanges, von lebendiger Gegenwart der Bilder, vom Zusammenhange und gleichsam

Nothdrange des Inhalts der Empfindungen, von Symmetrie der Worte, der Sylben, bei manchen sogar der Buchstaben, vom Gange der Melodie und von hundert andern Sachen, die zur lebendigen Welt, zum Spruch- und Nationalliede gehören und mit diesem verschwinden—davon und davon allein hängt das Wesen, der Zweck, die ganze wunderthätige Kraft ab, die diese Lieder haben, die Entzückung, die Triebfeder der ewige Erb- und Lustgesang des Volkes zu sein. The poetic expressions are never vague, but always "*sinnlich, klar* und *anschaulich*," their language scarcely contains abstract nouns. And all these excellences are the result of their pure, strong feeling. The spirit which fills their poetry may be rude and simple, but it is grand, powerful and solemn; it is the spirit of nature, "der Geist der Natur," which resounds in them.

JULIUS GOEBEL.

Extraits de la Chanson de Roland et de la Vie de Saint Louis par Jean de Joinville publiés avec introductions, notes et glossaires complets par GASTON PARIS, Membre de l'Institut. Paris, Hachette et Cie., 1887. 16mo, pp. 342.

It is a familiar fact that the fortunate moment when the services of the best minds can be secured for the preparation of elementary text-books in any new science, arrives comparatively late: the pioneers are too intent upon breaking virgin soil to find time to bestow on the more immediate needs of their younger followers. It is now some sixty years since FRIEDRICH DIEZ began laying the foundations of Romance philology. He was succeeded by a company of earnest specialists of high rank, of whom a few, and conspicuously the late PROFESSOR BARTSCH, turned incidentally aside from more ambitious labors to place in the hands of university students some of the necessary implements for advanced work. Their results were taken up in turn by more or less competent popularizers, who have furnished text-books intended to meet with some completeness the requirements of beginners. These books, however, useful as they are, have had to be put into the hands of pupils with numerous cautions, allowances and reserves; and it was not until the appearance of the little work whose title stands at the head of this notice that teachers have been able to say with confidence to their younger classes, wistful yet faltering at the threshold of an untried subject: "We have here, stowed compactly in a nut-shell by the experienced hand of one of the foremost of original investigators, the first essentials for a scientific introduction to the study of Old French." The book is moreover an appetizing foretaste of a whole series of volumes, comprising a "Manuel d'ancien français (XIe — XIVe siècle)," of which the first part, 'Esquisse de l'histoire de la littérature française au moyen âge,' has already appeared and will receive notice in our next issue.

All who are interested in taking up the study of the 'Roland' or of the 'Vie de Saint Louis,' either with classes or as private learners, will undoubtedly acquaint themselves at first hand with this collection of *Extraits*; there is accordingly no occasion for reciting in detail the plan and make-up of the book. Suffice it to say that we have here 784 verses of the Roland (normalized to the Île-de-France standard), and 988 lines of the 'Vie de Saint Louis,' preceded by a grammatical introduction of 102 pages, including phonetics, flexion, syntax and versification, and accompanied by notes and glossary, with etymologies.

At the close of his interesting preface M. PARIS remarks: "Je serais heureux, si cet essai était bien accueilli, de le perfectionner d'après les indications qu'on voudrait bien me donner, et dont je remercie d'avance ceux qui seraient disposés à me les fournir." Not so much with the assumption of being able to aid in perfecting a second edition, as in the interest of the many teachers and pupils who will desire, in the meantime, to make the most of the book in its present form, there will be given in what follows an enumeration of not a few minor defects, mostly of typography but sometimes of inadvertence, only too incidental to the first edition of a technical work.

In general it may be premised that the phonetics, the position of which at the head of the volume is theoretically warranted, can

only be taken up with profit by beginners, after practical familiarity has been gained with the text itself and with the accompanying chapters on flexion and syntax. The observations, moreover, are so briefly and technically stated as sometimes to leave the novice in perplexity, especially as the Old French examples are generally not accompanied by their Latin etyma and require to be searched for in the glossary; or, as happens not infrequently, no examples whatever are given. Thus, p. 20, §9: "La diphtongue *ai* provient . . . de *a* tonique à l'antépénultième suivi d'un *i* pénultième qui s'est changé en *j* (*ai, sai, aitre, repaidret*)." Here the beginner cannot be presumed to know, for the first example, that post-tonic *i* and *e* in hiatus are phonetic equivalents (HABEO = HABIO), and much would have been gained in clearness by printing these examples—and so throughout the chapter—(*ai* HABEO = HABIO, *sai* SAPIO, *aitre* ATRIUM, *repaidret* REPATRIAT) Again, the only thing the pupil has thus far been told about the sign *j* (which is of course new to him) is that it represents "*y* dans *yeux*, *i* dans *pied, entier*," without any light as to its phonetic nature or its occurrence. Both of the above points (*i*, *e* in hiatus, and the origin of *j*) are treated in §47, to which reference should be given. In fact, it will be found that many sections of this chapter call for careful elucidation in advance, on the part of the teacher.

Turning to points of detail: On (unnumbered) p. 12—a page easily escaping notice yet especially important, as presenting a table of the "Valeur phonétique des caractères employés"—we are told that "l'*u* dans les diphtongues se prononce comme *ou* très faible: *ȣu* = *ȣou*, *ȣ* = *ȣou*." A similar statement is less satisfactorily, because more ambiguously, made under §24 (cf. also §28): "Cette diphtongue (*ȣu*), où on *prononçait distinctement les deux voyelles*, provient," etc.—In the table of consonants, same page, read *s̆* for *s̈* and *z̆* for *z̈*.—At the bottom of this page, in a "remark," it is stated that a vowel is *libre* when it precedes a single consonant or the groups *tr*, *dr*, *pr*, *br* and "*quelques autres*." If these "others" had been specified as being the groups that contain the consonant following the last atonic vowel of a Latin word, the examples *chalt* CALET, *valt* VALET occurring at the end of §6, and *fiert* FERIT, *duelt* DOLET, etc., in the text of the Roland, would have been covered. In this remark should also have been explained what is meant by a *consonne appuyée*, viz., a consonant preceded by another consonant.

In §1 the vowel *u* (*ou*) is given in the regular list of vowels, but we are told in §25 that "le son *u* (*ou*) n'existait pas isolément en français au XIe siècle."—In §4 the group *ai* is included in the regular list of diphthongs and in §8 we read that "quand la diphtongue *ái* précède une consonne nasale l'*a* y est nasalisé; but in §9 we are told that it was "originairement prononcée *ái*, mais déjà à l'époque de la dernière rédaction du *Roland* elle se prononce *ȩ*;" yet this last is evidently not intended to apply to *ai* in such words as *paien*, *maior* §47. These slight or only apparent inconsistencies might have been avoided by parenthetical references or restrictions.—In §10, *petit* is given as an illustration of the statement that *ȩ* (i. e. so-called *e muet*) comes from an "*i* suivi d'un autre *i* dans la syllabe immédiatement suivante;" but in the glossary the etymology of *petit* is marked as (?).—In the same section, *prèier* is given as an example of the fact that "tout *e* protonique libre, dans le français du XIe siècle est un *ȩ*;" but in § 14 the same word is used to illustrate the statement that the diphthong *ȩi* comes from "*ȩ* suivi d'une palatale immédiate," which *ȩi* is said to have been pronounced "comme nous prononçons *eil* dans *pareil* sauf que l'*e* était fermé.—In § 15 occurs a curious misprint, which I am not certain how to set right. "La triphtongue *ieu* (*Dieu*) provient d'un *ȩ* tonique plus *u* atone; dans *gieuènt* elle est pour *neu*." What should be read here instead of "*neu*"? *Gieuènt* is clearly the same word as *jueènt*, which occurs only once in the 'Extraits' (viz. at v. 19), being the only form given in the glossary (the Oxford MS. has *iuent*). Indeed, in §91 (p. 59, l. 15) we read: *joer*, *gieuent* rentre dans cette classe, voy. § 15," viz., the class which diphthongizes *ȩ* to *ue*. Accordingly, *gieuènt* is an inconsequent spelling for *jueènt*, and *ieu* may be said to be for *ue*. —Under § 18, treating of "*i* à la tonique," there is no explanation of *gist* JACET (*giaist* > *gist*),

which occurs in the text. In § 19, "*i* à l'atone" is said to come from "*ē* sous l'influence d'un *e* suivant en hiatus, d' abord changé en *j*, dans *pitiet, quitier*." Is this "*ē*" given as an equivalent of the *ĭ* of PĬETATEM or is it a misprint for the *ī* of PĪETATEM? (It is noteworthy that the equivalence of Popular Latin *ē* and *ĭ*, *ō* and *ŭ*, is nowhere stated. Nor is there any tabular view of the equivalence of the Latin and Romance vowel systems.) In the same section *chrestiien* is given as an example of a *mot savant* in which "*i* à l'atone" comes from an *ĭ* in hiatus "contrairement à la regle;" but under § 46, treating of *s dure*, there is no mention of the irregular survival of *t* in *chrestiien* CHRISTIANUM (cf. *angoissier* ANGUSTIARE), although in § 125 (p. 80, l. 1 ff.) we read: "Déjà le mot *chrestiien* est un mot que la forme décèle comme n'étant pas vraiment populaire."—(Under § 20, "Cette diphtongue (*ie*) . . . provient en outre de *a* influencé par le *j* suivant dans le suffixe *-ier*= ARIUM," it is interesting to observe that M. PARIS takes sides with FÖRSTER against GRÖBER on this question.)—Page 29, l. 8, read *ʒ* for *z*.—P. 44, l. 10 from below, read [*abét*] for [*abet*].—P. 45, § 64, "plusieurs noms propres germaniques . . . ont un *e* au sujet, et le régime, où l'accent se déplace, est en *on*;" as examples, *Charle Charlon* is given by the side of *Guénele Guenelon*, etc. In the text, however, *Charles* is always used as the nominative form, while in the oblique case *Charle* and *Charlon* alternate in accordance with the requirements of the rhythm.—P. 46, l. 5 from below, read *altre* for first *altres*.—P. 48, l. 2, read *maiors* for last *maior*.—P. 49, l. 4 from below, read §§ 132, 133 for §§ 123, 124, (p. 50, l. 4 from below, *ditto*).—P. 50, in the paradigm of the personal pronouns, the *tonic* forms of dat. and acc. should, for the benefit of beginners, be distinguished from their corresponding *atonic* forms.—P. 51, fem. nom. pl. of *mes*, read *mes* for *mei*.—In the paradigm of the "possessif de la pluralité" (p. 52) the forms are so crowded as to lead easily to confusion. All will be made clear by drawing three vertical lines in such a manner as to leave one form for the singular and two forms for the plural of each gender, thus:

nostre | nostre, nost; | nostre | nostres, noz.

On the same page the printer has "pied" completely the paradigm of the "pronom démonstatif," so far as the *cas régime* is concerned. It should read: masc. sing. *icest, icel*; pl. *icez, icels*: fem. sing. *iceste, icele*; pl. *icestes, iceles*.— P. 53, § 75, read: "il y un neutre *quei*, devant les voyelles *queid*," for "il y a un neutre *queid*, devant les voyelles *quei* (stated correctly §§ 37, 132).—P. 54, l. 5, read § 132 for § 123.—In § 83 the student is told to form the futures and conditionals of verbs by means of the pres. and imperf. of the verb *aveir*, but the paradigm of *aveir* (and of *estre*) is nowhere given; the forms of the pres. may indeed be picked out of the glossary, but those of the imperf. do not occur even there. Complete paradigms of *aveir* and *estre* need to be supplied by the teacher.—P. 55, l. 8, read *-t* for *-st*.—P. 57, l. 4 from below, read *colchiét* for *colchét*.—P. 61, 3d sing. pres. of paradigm, read *tradissèt* for *tradissét*.—In § 103 there seems to be an infelicity in the statement of the use of the oblique case as a genitive (the italics are mine): Le cas régimé . . . s'emploie . . . , mais uniquement *devant* les noms de personne: 1° "Avec la fonction du génitif, seulement *devant* un nom au singulier (li rei gonfaniers),"—and so for the dative. Brunot's statement is as follows, (*Gram.* p. 225–6): "La préposition (*de*) ne s'emploie pas dans le cas d'un génitif subjectif où le terme au génitif est un nom de personne."—P. 69, l. 2 from below (and p. 78, 14) we read *eschieles*, but in the text of the 'Roland' (v. 97) and in the glossary, *eschieres*.—P. 73, l. 6, read *jo* for *je* and 130 for 140; l. 11, *arrestant* is in the text (v. 381) printed *arestant*—P. 75, l. 2, read 329 for 330; l. 5, read (?) for 360.—P. 85, l. 4 read *li arcevesques* for *l'arcevesques*; l. 5, read *l'arcevesques* for *li arcevesques*; l. 12, read *-èt* for *-ѐt*.—P. 86. l. 3, read *se* for *te*.—P. 87, under "masculines" read *é* for *ѐ* and *ò* for *ö*, and under "féminines" read [*é–e*] for [*ѐ–e*].—P. 88, l. 2 from below, read § 8 for § 9.—P. 90, §13*, l. 3 read *gn* (*seigneur*) for *n* (*seineur*); § 15* read *òu* for *óu* and *óu* for *òu*.—P. 92, § 28*, read *óu* for *ou*.—§ 49*, l. 6, read § 25* for 26*.—P. 97, l. 3, read 103* for 103; § 103*, fourth example, read 251 for 250; eighth example, read 923 for 925. Same page, l. 9 from below, read 427 for 426, l. 7 from below, read 486 for 487.—P. 98, l.

12 from below, read 286 for 285; same line, read (?) for 407; last line, read 14 for 4.

For the extracts from the 'Roland' no indication is given of what passages are quoted (a similar omission has not been made in the case of the extracts from the 'Vie de Saint Louis'). As the teacher, at least, will have frequent occasion to refer to the text of the Oxford 'Roland,' I give here, for convenience, the necessary indications, obtained by comparison with Gautier's edition: Extract i (vv. 96–121); ii (814–840); iii (994–1187); iv (1412–1437); v (1680–1850); vi (2164–2396); vii (2855–2973).

The constitution and printing of the text of the extracts has been very careful and exact, but *Rollanz* is put for *Rodlanz* v. 89, *Gabriel* for *Gabriël* v. 527; and in note 17, p. 113, *Guenle* is printed for *Guénele* (though perhaps intentionally), P. 111, note 13, l. 2, read 457 for 461. P. 141, note 68 should be referred to verse 443 instead of 445, and note 69 (p. 142), to verse 445 instead of 456. If any note was intended for the latter verse, it has dropped out.

In the preface, p. 11, we read: "Les glossaires, pour la confection desquels j'ai été aidé par M. Daniel Grand, archiviste-paléographe, ont été redigés avec un soin minutieux et de façon à être absolument complets." This confidence in the assistant has not been wholly justified. In verse 626 (Devers la teste sour lo cuer li descent) *devers* means *à partir de*: the only definition given in the glossary is *du côté de*.—*dis* (DECEM) v. 568, is wanting.—*Envers*, v. 534 (Sour l'erbe verte la est chedeiz envers), is given only as a preposition in the glossary; it is here an adverb, meaning *sur le dos*. (Parts of speech are discriminated in the glossary only by the meanings of the words; e. g., *menut* as adj. and adv., is treated under two distinct heads, but in neither case is the part of speech specified.) —*Feïstes*, vv. 307, 324, is not given in its alphabetical place.—*Fidance*, in verse 598 (Constantinoble, dont il out la fidance), means *hommage*; the definition given is *confiance*.—*Fit*, v. 196 (Bataille avrez, vos en estes tot fit) is wanting. Needless to say that it is Latin FIDI 'certains.' —*Ja*, which occurs several times with the meaning *jamais* (cf. v. 46, ja n'en avrai eschange; v. 79, malvaise essemple n'en serat ja de mei), and in the sense of 'certes' (cf. vv. 127, 303, Jol vos plevis, ja retorneront Franc) is defined only as *déjà*.—*Ors*, v. 562 (Fenduz en est mes olifanz el gros, Chedeiz en est li cristals e li ors), is given as nom. pl. of *ors* URSUM, 'ours.' In a foot-note on the verse; "Cent livres valt li ors dont est garnie" (corresponing to v. 516 of the Oxford 'Roland'), M. GASTON PARIS says, *Rom*, xi, 402: Le MS. de Châteauroux a bien compris le mot *or* en le traduisant par *orle*, qui l'avait remplacé de son temps: il signifie 'bordure' (voy. *Rom.* x, 43). Au contraire dans le texte de Venise, *or* a été compris comme AURUM, contresens qu'ont commis, ainsi que Conrad le clerc, tous les traducteurs modernes." The word as here used doubtless means *gold* rather than *rim*, since the assonance is in *ò*, and *ors* 'bordure' comes probably from Lat. ŌRA (cf. It. *órlo*); but it seems somewhat like the irony of fate that six years after the appearence of the above note in the *Romania*, M. PARIS should himself be made, through an assistant, to translate the word *ors* in this connection *bears*, and that too in the assonance of a laisse in *ò*!—*Par*, v. 693 (tant par est angoissos) has the force of an intensive, like the *per* in Lat. *per-nimium*, Late Lat. *per-fervidus* etc., and this use has survived in the Mod. Fr., *c'est par trop fort*. It is not noted in the glossary.—The only meaning assigned to *retorner* is 'retourner, revenir en arrière,' yet in v. 117 the reading "Socorrat nos, si retornerat l'ost" (=ferat l'ost retorner, v. 138) requires the definition 'faire retourner.' Yet why should this reading be preferred to, or even considered as good as, the Oxford lection, "Si returnerat l'oz"? cf. vv. 127, 303, ja retorneront Franc.—*Tenir*, in the phrase *tenir le pas* (vv. 231, 670), i. e. *retenir*, is not mentioned.—*Tot* in the phrase *a tot* (v. 455), receives no attention in the glossary of the 'Roland,' but is carefully explained in that of the 'Saint Louis.'—*Vendront*, v. 289 (Ainz qued il muirent se vendront il molt chier), is given in the glossary as the 3d pl. fut. of *venir* (instead of *vendre*) with a reference to this particular passage.

The glossary to the 'Saint Louis' appears to have been edited with much more care, but the word *queus* COQUUS is omitted, which occurs

p. 225, l. 32 (manjoit paciënment ce que ses queus li appareilloit), also *ier* HERI, p. 227, l. 72.—The erroneous citations in the two glossaries are not of sufficient consequence to be noted at the end of so long an article.

Such a list as the above is regrettable, it must be confessed; yet the errors and omissions involved, most of them slight, are such as can easily be rectified by the teacher, who will be only too grateful to have at his disposition an elementary text-book so succinct, so complete, so admirably annotated; in short, so authoritative, so scholarly. The manner in which the etymologies have been treated in the glossaries is especially satisfactory. As an illustration of the cautious and conscientious procedure of the editor in such matters, the following instance is well worth citing. The etymology of the word *osberc* is here given as "*germ.* ? et *germ.* berc." In the *Romania* for July, 1888, p. 427, M. PARIS returns to this etymology, as follows: . . . L'absence d'*h* n'est pas la seule singularité du mot *osberc*. Si le mot vient, comme on ne saurait guère douter, de l'allemand *halsberc*, il nous présente en outre *o=au=al* à une époque ou au moins dans un texte où il n'y a pas encore d'exemple même de la vocalisation de *l*. Cette difficulté m'a tellement frappé que, dans le glossaire de mes *Extraits de la Chanson de Roland*, j'ai cru devoir laisser douteuse l'origine du premier élément de ce mot. Aujourd'hui je pense pouvoir l'expliquer également par l'origine provençale de cette forme." (M. PARIS does not seem to have been aware that this explanation had already been offered by SUCHIER in GRÖBER'S 'Grundriss' vol. i, p. 664, § 106).—The only etymology I have noticed as seeming to call for modification is that of *porofrir* ("por *pour* pro *et* offërire *pour* offerre")." Is not *por* in this compound rather the *por* of Lat. *porrigo*, *portendo*, *pol-liceor*, *pono* (*pos-sino*) etc., which in the ordinary Latin lexicons, to be sure, is interchangeable with *pro*, but which according to BRÉAL, 'Dict. lat. étym.' s. v. *por*, is not to be so confounded, *pro* answering to Sk. *pra* Gr. πρό; *por* to Sk. *prati*, Gr. προρί. Later, of course, *por* in *porofrir* would have been confused with Fr. *pour* = Lat. *pro*.

H. A. TODD.

Practical Lessons in German Conversation. A Companion to all German Grammars. By DR. A. L. MEISSNER, Librairie Hachette & Cie., London; Karl Schoenhof, Boston. 1888. 247 pp.

An Introduction to German at Sight. By EUGENE H. BABBITT. D. C. Heath & Co., Boston, 1888. 29 pp.

The appearance of DR. MEISSNER'S German Grammar (first edition) kindled in many teachers of German a desire to see more of the author's work, especially in the direction of practical German exercises, that feature in which the grammar gave the greatest satisfaction. The book before us is the gratification of that desire. The work is opposed on the one hand to the method of slovenly "picking up of a language by a short residence abroad," and on the other to the method of teaching grammar by a heterogeneous jumbling of incoherent sentences. The inviolable *sentence fetich* of many of the earlier exercise and conversation books has been skilfully supplanted by a well graded series of connected sentences in colloquial form. Each lesson contains three exercises, German on one page and English on the other: (1) a number of simple sentences to be asked by the teacher and answered by the pupil; (2) a colloquy between pupil and teacher; (3) a short connected narrative to be thoroughly analyzed and discussed in German. The scope of the book is very comprehensive, ranging from the simplest questions about every-day life to the more complicated details of travel, commerce, history, and literature. Indeed, this comprehensiveness almost amounts to a fault in the work. It is to be regretted that the author did not furnish his book with a thorough index or at least a detailed table of contents. The work is good in other respects and actually meets the "long-felt need" which is the prefatory wail of many of its predecessors.

The second work mentioned in our heading attempts to reduce to the minimum that part of Grammar absolutely essential to a reading knowledge of German. Pages 5-7, addressed to the student, contain many valuable suggestions. The next ten pages are taken up with grammatical remarks and references; the remaining ten are devoted to German selections

to be translated into English. A vocabulary is supplied in the foot-notes. The author's idea of helping the student to a hasty reading knowledge of German without all the details of grammar, is a good one; but he seems to have underrated the difficulty of acquiring a reading vocabulary in German. Five times as many pages of German text would be necessary to familiarize the student with the vocabulary and syntax of an easy German novel. The royal road even to a reading knowledge is one of patient toil, and we think there is for the student of language a choice kernel of wisdom in the German proverb: "Eile mit Weile."

M. D. LEARNED.

Johns Hopkins University.

ENGLISH LITERATURE.

English Writers. By HENRY MORLEY, LL. D. Vol. III. From the Conquest to Chaucer. Cassell & Co., 1888.

The third volume of PROFESSOR MORLEY'S 'English Writers' was published during the past summer, and brings his history of English literature to the early fourteenth century. As in the previous volumes, PROFESSOR MORLEY glances at the current of thought in other European countries, considering now the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, and briefly touching upon the early Arabian influence, the early Provençal literature, and the influence of the Crusades. This volume is necessarily filled with notices of the Latin chroniclers who occupied such a conspicuous position in mediæval English literature from Florence of Worcester (†1118) to Ralph Higden (†1363). England is fortunate in having so many historians of this period, many of them men of marked ability and learning. It is, however, strange how these chroniclers copied from each other without acknowledgement. MR. THOMAS ARNOLD, in the preface to his edition of Henry of Huntingdon's 'Historia Anglorum' (ROLLS Series), one of the most valuable of these chronicles, has given us an interesting view of "the lines along which the automatic energy of the country developed itself in the four centuries and a half from the death of Beda" (735), thus connecting Beda with Matthew Paris, the great chronicler of the thirteenth century. In this volume Ordericus Vitalis, William of Malmesbury, and Geoffrey of Monmouth, are noticed at greatest length of the early twelfth century chroniclers, although the work of the last-mentioned is characterized as "a work of imagination, published before such works were a recognized part of the highest literature," and William of Newbury's oft-quoted testimony to Geoffrey's lack of veracity is duly recorded. "Moreover," says William, "in this book that he calls the History of the Britons, how saucily and how shamelessly he lies almost throughout, no one, unless ignorant of the old histories, when he falls upon that book, can doubt."

Evidently, William did not appreciate the rise of fiction in England, and the value of that work which serves as the basis of the only well-developed romantic cycle in English literature.

PROFESSOR MORLEY has a high regard for Walter Map, "who gave a soul to the Arthurian romances," and he thinks that Map wrote "most probably the Latin original of Robert Borron's introductory romance of the Saint Graal, and certainly Lancelot of the Lake, the Quest of the Saint Graal and the Mort Artus." Walter Map and the King Arthur Romances occupy a considerable space in the volume and are treated in an interesting manner. Map's detestation of the Cistercians is more than once commented on, and PROFESSOR MORLEY attributes to Map both the 'Apocalypse' and the 'Confession of Golias,' and gives a full summary of the former work. He regards him, too, as the author of the familiar

"Meum est propositum in tabernia mori,"

and says, "in what has been taken by those for whom words are sound not sense, as the first verse of a jovial song, Map images the heavens opening upon the drunkard priest who lies in a tavern, where, too weak himself to hold the wine-cup, he has it put to his lips, and so dies in his shame." But may not Map, or one of his followers, have appropriated the song to his own purpose? Nigel Wireker's 'Brunellus' comes in for a share of notice

and shows us that the mediæval writers were not without humor of their own.

Among the later twelfth century chroniclers Giraldus Cambrensis is most fully treated, and Roger of Hoveden and Benedict of Peterborough, whose chronicle Roger made much use of,—though PROFESSOR MORLEY, following PROFESSOR STUBBS, denies to Benedict the chronicle that goes under his name,—receive due attention. Both of the last-named chronicles were edited by PROFESSOR (now BISHOP) STUBBS for the ROLLS Series, that of Benedict in two volumes (1867), and that of Roger in four volumes (1868–71). It is to these two chroniclers of the reigns of Henry II and Richard I that we owe the text of the short 'Here Prophecy,' noticed by PROFESSOR MORLEY (pp. 200-201). It is one of the earliest specimens of Middle English, preceding by a few years Layamon's Brut. PROFESSOR MORLEY says that Benedict "gives two versions, and the second as the more correct," as follows:

> "Whan thu ses in Here hert yreret
> Then sulen Engles in three be ydelet:
> That an sal into Yrland al to late waie
> That other into Puille mid prude bileue
> The thride in hire athen hert alle wreke y-dreghe."

"But the last mysterious line Hoveden reports to have been:

> The thridde into Air hahen herd all wreke y drechegen."

This is interpreted by PROFESSOR MORLEY as follows, with allusion to the expeditions to Ireland, to Apulia, and to the Holy Land:

"When thou seest a hart reared up in Here, then shall the English people be divided into three parts: one shall go all too late into Ireland; the other into Apulià, with profitable remaining; the third in their highest [?] oaths, all drawn to vengeance." "The last, line, as given by Hoveden," says, PROFESSOR MORLEY, "is a corruption. This is my own guess at the unsolved riddle of the last part of the 'Here Prophecy,' and if not in every word right, it seems to give the true general sense."

Let us examine it a little more closely and see, even at the risk of occupying more space than the Prophecy would seem to deserve. I can find but one form of the Prophecy in Benedict (ed. STUBBS, ii, 139), which is as follows:

> "*Zan. zu. seches. in. here, hert. yreret.*
> *Zan sulen Hengles in zre be ydeled*
> *Zat han sale into Hyrlande alto ladewaya*
> *Zat hozer into Poile mid þride bileve*
> *Ze thirde in hayre haughen hert alle [omitted] ydreghe.*"

Here the use of *z* for *þ* and the misapplication of *h* are manifest. In a note PROFESSOR STUBBS gives Hoveden's version and HEARNE'S conjectural emendation from WANLEY, with a translation, but the *text* is printed in Hoveden (ed. STUBBS, iii, 68), as follows:

> *þan þu seches in Here hert yreret:*
> *þan sulen Engles in thre be ydeled,*
> *þat an sal into Yrlande altolate waie,*
> *þat oher into Puille mid prude bileve,*
> *þe thridde into airhahen herd alle wreke ydrehegen.*"

A *second* form is given in a note to Hoveden, from another MS., but its only important variation is *her hahen* for *airhahen*. HEARNE'S emendation gives *seest* for *seches*, *lede wey* for *late waie*, *hire azen* for *airhahen*, which is also plain, and PROFESSOR STUBBS translates:

> "When thou seest in Here hart reared.
> Then shall English in three be dealed.
> The one shall into Ireland all-to lead way.
> The other into Apulia, with pride, in speed."

The third in their own heart all sorrow endure (dree)."

This is much nearer the correct translation than that of PROFESSOR MORLEY, who mistakes *prude bileve*, *athen*, and *ydreghe*, though *bileve* might be the verb 'remain' if we could read 'in' for 'into.' As all the texts except the one in MORLEY read *seches*, I should prefer 'seekest' for 'seest.' The 'hart' refers to the figure of the stag that Ralph, or according to Hoveden, William, Fitz Stephen placed upon his 'new house' at Here, which PROFESSOR MORLEY refers to Hever in Kent, but PROFESSOR STUBBS prefers Harford in Devonshire, which belonged to the family of Fitz Stephen, as he knows of nothing that connects Hever with the Fitz Stephens.

In the following chapters Layamon's 'Brut' is treated, with a synopsis of a portion of the chronicle, and more briefly the 'Ormulum'

and the 'Ancren Riwle.' The so-called 'Canute's Song' is given as follows (p. 240):

> "Merie sungen the munaches binnan Ely
> Tha Cnut ching reuther by;
> 'Rotheth cnites noer the land
> And here ye thes Munaches sæng.'"

It stands in this form in MORLEY'S "First Sketch of English Literature" and in MORLEY and TYLER'S "Manual," although ARNOLD has long since corrected, in his "Manual," the manifest errors of the text. Other early songs and ballads follow, together with an account of the early Welsh bards. 'King Horn' is very briefly noticed, but a full summary of 'Havelok' is given. Other early English romances are considered at more or less length, and this chapter closes with a full summary of 'King Alisaunder'

The origin of the Dominican and Franciscan Friars in England is narrated, preliminary to an interesting account of Robert Grosseteste and Roger Bacon, both of whom PROFESSOR MORLEY admires greatly. 'Genesis and Exodus,' 'The Owl and Nightingale' and some other thirteenth century works are too briefly treated, and the account of the chronicles is resumed with that of Robert of Gloucester, our first chronicler in English since Layamon. The most noted chronicler of this century, Matthew Paris, receives, I think, too short a notice, especially since his works are now accessible in the ROLLS Series. SIR FREDERIC MADDEN'S Preface to the 'Historia Minor' is very full, and we learn from it that Matthew Paris died in 1259, whereas from PROFESSOR MORLEY'S account we should infer that he was alive subsequent to 1273. A reading of this Preface shows also that there was no such writer as Matthew of Westminster, who figures on p. 346, but that the work which passes under his name is an abridgment of Roger of Wendover's 'Flores Historiarum' made by Matthew Paris, and part of it is written in his own hand. Robert of Brunne's chronicle and his 'Handlyng Synne' and a full account of the 'Gesta Romanorum' chiefly fill the following chapter and complete the history of the literature. The volume closes with some account of the Italian Revival and the birth of Dante. We are thus brought down to CHAUCER, the previous literature having been considered and the way prepared for his coming.

As in the volumes on Anglo-Saxon literature the account of early English literature in this volume invites comparison with that of PROFESSOR TEN BRINK, which, while not so full, is more critical. PROFESSOR MORLEY, however, is narrating the development of the English mind in all forms of literature, and in the English, French, and Latin languages, and he seeks to trace whatever may have influenced that mental development. Although the work seems to me occasionally to lack perspective, there is nothing to take its place, and it bids fair to be the fullest, and, we may hope, the best history of English literature that we possess.

JAMES M. GARNETT.
University of Virginia.

Preparatory French Reader By O. B. SUPER, Ph. D. 12mo. pp. iv, 224. Boston: D. C. Heath & Co. 1888.

The compiler of this little book believes in early and copious reading, and with this in view has collected some fifteen selections in prose with nine short poems (the latter averaging under a page and a half each). The selections are progressive in character, commencing with short translations from ANDERSEN'S tales and continuing with one from the Brothers GRIMM and another from MME DE GIRARDIN. The second part is more advanced, containing tales or selections from ERCKMANN-CHATRIAN, A. DUMAS, A. DAUDET, MÉRY, and MME FOA, averaging some eight pages each. The third part consists of 'Les Prisonniers du Caucase' by XAVIER DE MAISTRE. It may be doubted whether the editor has done wisely in taking "liberties with the texts" of the authors from whom he has drawn, in order to "furnish, as far as possible, easy and interesting reading for beginners." One would prefer to have the text of acknowledged masters left intact, especially as there is no real need for effecting any modification. In the wide domain of French literature it would not be difficult to find material for the compilation of a preparatory Reader without need of any changes. The object of the author has been to remove as many difficulties as possible by eliminating

unusual constructions, restricting and simplifying the vocabulary etc., so that the Reader is emphatically a "preparatory" one, and suitable especially for schools and strictly junior students. As the poems are at the end of the collection and are presumably meant to be read last, it would not have been difficult to make a selection which would have been much more representative of the beauty of French poetry, while remaining strictly within the scope of the book. Owing to the simplicity of the text the editor has not found it necessary to insert many notes. In those given, however, one sometimes misses the *mot de l'énigme.* For example, on p. 167, "*je vais conduire*, for *je conduirai*," the pupil has a right to be told that *aller* is necessarily used to express an *immediate* future.—P. 170, "*dès l'aurore* 'at dawn;'" here 'at earliest dawn' would bring out the specific meaning of *dès* (DE IPSO).—P. 171, "*il était*, 'there was,' impersonal construction;" add, "more vague and general than *il y avait.*"—P. 178, "*à quoi bon vivre*, 'what's the good of living?'" The important point here to note is the construction, viz., *vivre* (*est*) *bon à quoi*, which few beginners will discover for themselves.—P. 179. In the "observation" on French versification, no mention is made of one of its most characteristic features, viz., the required alternation of masculine and feminine rimes; and nothing is said of the existence of a caesura.

A vocabulary is added, which gives in full-face type the English word derived from the French. A very cursory glance shows points requiring correction. *Grésil, orgueil, orteil, sept*, are represented as being pronounced respectively *grézi, orguë-i, ortë-i, sé* (only); and *splinn* is an unfortunate representation of the pronunciation of *spleen.* On the other hand, the pronunciation of various exceptional words (such as *coq d'Inde, emmener, fusil, ouest*, etc.) is omitted; nor is there any indication as to which of the words with initial *h* have an aspirate. Moreover, would that the time might come when so simple and feasible a matter as the distinction between open and closed *a, e*, and *o*, wherever in doubt, might be clearly marked in such vocabularies as this, for the benefit of many teachers as well as of all pupils!

In connection with verbs there is nothing (except the oftentimes undecisive definition, cf. *avancer, baigner, crever*), to show whether they are transitive, intransitive, or both; and the definitions sometimes leave even the essential meaning in obscurity; cf. *emmener*, 'to take away, take along;' *enlever*, 'to take or carry away;' *entraîner*, 'to carry away, take along.' Yet this is just the stage at which to point the pupil to accurate discrimination of the fact that *emmener* means 'to *lead* away,' *enlever*, 'to *carry* away,' *entraîner*, 'to *draw* away;' so also of *retourner* and *revenir* (both of which are defined 'to return'), that *retourner* means 'to *go* back,' *revenir* 'to *come* back.' Words so nearly alike in spelling in French and English "as to cause no difficulty," are not given. This, or oversight, excludes within the first four pages, *cheveux, dépit, prune, quand, quelqu'un.* A regrettable omission is that of the numbering of the lines in the margin of the text.

Misprints are few: p. 4, l. 1, read *était* for *staït*; p. 5, l. 2, read *plus* for *pius*; p. 7. l. 14, read *rafraîchir* for *refraîchir;* p. 17, l. 9, read *pensées* for *penseés*; p. 217, under *résoudre* read *résolu* for *resolu. Joyeuses, rayonnait, oreillettes* are wrongly divided (*joy-euses, ray-onnait, oreill-etes*, p. 4. l. 21; p. 9, l. 13; p. 42, l. 12). Such words admit of division neither before nor after the *y* or *ill.*

The book, which is admirably printed and exceedingly convenient, is well adapted to the wants of strictly junior students, for whom it has been produced.

T. McCABE.

University of Michigan.

Die Aussprache des Lateinischen. Versuch einer practischen Lösung dieser Frage auf wissenschaftlicher Basis. Von KARL PÖTZL. Nebst einem Anhang über die Schulmethode. 129 pp. Leipzig: Wilhelm Friedrich. 1888.

That a work treating of the pronunciation of Latin should have to stand its test before the forum of the MOD. LANG. NOTES no one will be disposed to deny, especially in the case of a book like that before us, which is largely based upon the supposed evidence of the Romance languages. In the course of his investigation, the author betrays, unfortunately, such a lack of knowledge of the principles of

linguistics, and particularly of phonetics, that we may seem to be rendering some incidental service to the cause of modern philology, by examining his work briefly in these columns.

The author's contention is in behalf of the modern Italian pronunciation of Latin. He tries to prove for Latin what ENGEL ('Aussprache des Griechischen') undertook to show for the Greek, and with a like result. (For a review of ENGEL's book, cf. *Berliner Philologische Wochenschrift*, 1881). CORSSEN's work is made the chief object of attack, and this by a man who expressly states that it "has remained without important successors" (p. 14). Of SEELMANN's exhaustive study, which appeared in 1885 ('Die Aussprache des Latein nach physiologisch-historischen Grundsätzen,' 397 pp.), not to speak of the many valuable contributions in the scientific journals, PÖTZL has simply never heard.

For the last five centuries the Italian language has undergone but slight changes—for this truth DIEZ is his authority. Now, "a nation of such tenacity and such mental and physical well-being cannot possibly have allowed their language to suffer decay, *ergo*, we may as well double the number of centuries —this is, as he says, a "Rechenexempel"—and fix the age of the present Italian pronunciation at a thousand years. Thus we are brought nearly into contact with the later classical period, and the author's further investigations are designed to prove that "the pronunciation (of Latin) used in our days by the Italians and closely related to that of their own idiom, was that of the ancient Romans." This, his principal idea, aside from the folly of introducing into linguistics such surprising arithmetical processes as the above, is, of course, totally misleading. Not Italian but those languages that branched off first from the parent-stock, such as the Sardinian, Spanish, Portuguese, etc., are of chief importance for the pronunciation of Latin and for our knowledge of Vulgar Latin, of which, by the way, far more is known than one might imagine from PÖTZL's many strange vagaries.

Phonetics is the science of the sounds of *human* speech. PÖTZL seems to confound it with the laws of sound in general; we cannot otherwise explain his constant reference to "the German tongue," "the German ear," "CORSSEN ist wohl dabei gewesen," etc. For his own irrational explanations he demands our unquestioning assent. Contradictions are numerous. On page 56, for instance, we read that a thousand years are certainly sufficient to bring about a perceptible change in a language.

The greater part of the book is taken up with a discussion of the pronunciation of *c* before palatal vowels, which constitutes the chief argument for the author's posited Italian pronunciation. The Greek sound, as ENGEL has proven (?), is *tje*, *tji* (PÖTZLS notation is reproduced), therefore Greek transliterations of Latin words prove at least a palatal pronunciation of *c* before *e* and *i*. *Tj* and Ital. *ć* seem to PÖTZL so much the same that he uses them interchangeably; indeed, after having read through his discussion, one is absolutely at a loss which sound to give to the *c* in question. In a former article I have already had something to say upon the change of *t*>*c* and *c*>*t* (cf. MOD. LANG. NOTES, vol. iii, cols. 126 et 192); according to PÖTZL such a change is possible only with the Italian pronunciation of the *c*. As a proof he gives *Κῦρος* > *Τῦρος* in Lucan. But how about *κλῆμα* > *τλῆμα* in the same writer? The evidences of the Germanic languages PÖTZL gets rid of in the same easy manner. Lat. CICER, pronounced *tchitcher*, can most naturally, as he thinks, become *chicher*—*kicher*. Not a word about German phonetic laws! And then follows the remark that "he who has only *tschitscher* before his eyes, or ears, should expect a word like *schischer*." Certainly. As the Dutch *sisererwt* shows,[1] that word was introduced after the year 700, while *Kicher* found its way into German at an earlier date, when *c* had the guttural sound. The same with CRUCEM *kreutz*, not found, of course, before the introduction of Christianity. That the orthography and pronunciation of modern Slavic names, and finally Hungarian texts from the year 1182–1484, can be brought forward as an argument for the Latin, is one of those conjectures which scarcely call for refutation.

The remarks upon the vowels are scanty, as

1. KLUGE, 'Etymologisches Wörterbuch,' does not mention that this word occurs also in South German dialects. E. g. *Zisern*, *kichern*, *arbas* und *bon*. PICHLER, 'Über das Drama des mittelalters in Tyrol,' (p. 155.)

"only little can be said of them." Whether the following description of the *o*-sound is the outcome of confusion or something worse we leave our readers to determine: "Vom *o* möchte ich jedoch eines berichten, weil es wieder die genaue Überlieferung der lateinischen Aussprache durch die Italiener klar vor Augen liegt. Das lange *o* sprechen die Italiener meist offen (wie in *sott*, *Hort*), wir Deutschen nach den Gewohnheiten unserer Muttersprache immer geschlossen (wie in *Sohn*). Wie nun die Lateiner sprachen, sagt uns ein alter Gewährsmann (Sergius, 'Donat.' I, p. 520, 30 f. K): Similiter et o quando longa est, intra palatum sonat: *Roma* (noch heute so), *orator*, quando brevis est primis labris exprimitur (ebenso durch die Italiener)."

It would be useless to argue with an author who quotes *amiche*, *lunghezza*, *chi*, *chiarezza* in the same breath, and who displays on every page his want of acquaintance not only with modern but even with classical grammatical literature.

H. SCHMIDT-WARTENBERG.

University of Deseret.

BRIEF MENTION.

'La Tulipe Noire' of ALEXANDRE DUMAS is the latest novel issued from the press of W. R. Jenkins, forming a book of attractive appearance and considerable size (304 pp.). We notice that the same house undertakes a series of Spanish plays, of which 'La Independencia,' a comedy by HERREROS, is now offered to the public at the same price as the single numbers of the 'Théâtre Contemporain.'

The Pitt Press Series (Cambridge) presents two additional French texts for class use: SEDAINE'S 'Le Philosophe sans le savoir,' edited by H. A. BULL, and a second and complete edition of LAMARTINE'S 'Jeanne d'Arc' with "notes historical and philological" by A. C. CLAPIN. The notes, as is usual in this series save when MR. SAINTSBURY is editor, are of decidedly inferior quality. A vocabulary appended to the text of 'Jeanne d'Arc' makes it however a handy book for beginners.

Among the deprints from the *Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie* is a note by R. OTTO on a Catalan poem "Lo conqueriment de Maylorcha," which has hitherto been placed among the lost works of RAMON LULL. OTTO'S investigations lead him to find in a later poet, ROMEU LULL, the author of the poem.

Another deprint from the same periodical is a poem on the battle of Lepanto by GIOVANNI BONASERA, written in the Sicilian dialect of the sixteenth century, and edited from a Munich MS. by DR. VON REINHARDSTÖTTNER.

The following work was presented at the session, held on April 5, 1888, of the Anthropological Society of Paris: 'Le Patois briard du Canton d'Esternay,' Paris, 1888, in-8vo., 79 pages. This book of M. C. A. PIÉTREMENT is an extract from the *Revue linguistique* where it appeared in 1887 and 1888. It is divided into two parts. The first treats of "Le Brie, les Briards et leur langage," the second is a "Vocabulaire des mots briards du canton d'Esternay," containing about three hundred words not found in the large French dictionaries of BESCHERELLE, LAROUSSE or LITTRÉ.

Through the liberality of MR. S. TEACKLE WALLIS of the Baltimore bar, the library of the Johns Hopkins University has come into possession of a collection of Spanish plays, printed evidently by some literary society of the last century. The plays are chosen from among a large number of theatrical pieces, each bearing the number of its order in the series, and were mainly published at Barcelona, though the presses of Madrid, Salamanca and Seville are also represented. Of the nine quarto volumes thus made up, five, comprising some seventy-five plays, are devoted to CALDERON, while the remaining four contain selections, to the number of sixty-odd dramas, from other leading authors of the flowering period of the Spanish stage. The difficulty experienced in securing specimens of the theatre of the Peninsula (the "Biblioteca de los autores españoles" being the only recent publication which furnishes them in any number) renders the gift of MR. WALLIS all the more valuable and opportune.

The ninth publication of VOLLMÖLLER'S "Sammlung Französischer Neudrucke" is the 'Psaultier' of BAÏF, edited by DR. E. J. GROTH (Heilbronn: Henninger). DR. GROTH brings to his work a solid acquaintance with the

Pléiade school and a lively appreciation of BAÏF's literary merit and influence. A concise introduction, which discusses briefly the origin of the 'Psaultier' and BAÏF's relation to the music of the time, precedes the textual reproduction of the MS. containing the first sixty-eight psalms. Of interest is the phonetical orthography deduced from the labors of RAMUS, employed by BAÏF with the intention of bringing poetry and music more closely together; and from the metres of classical antiquity, where quantity takes the place of accent and the verse is without rime. A comparison of this MS. (1567-69) with a second and similar version of the year 1573, and with a third version of 1587, where the rime reappears and the orthography returns to the common form, is indicated by means of the successive paraphrases of the twenty-third psalm. Remarks follow and a vocabulary of antiquated or phonetically disguised words. It is to be hoped by all scholars interested in the artistic and literary history of the sixteenth century that DR. GROTH may soon give to the public the complete study of BAÏF which he evidently has in preparation.

The 'Pronunciation of Spanish in Spain and America' (Hoboken, N. J.: Published by the author) is the title of a pamphlet in which PROF. CHARLES F. KROEH, of the Stevens Institute of Technology, offers the student his valuable aid in the study and practice of the sounds of the Spanish language. The mode of treatment followed by PROF. KROEH is both simple and practical, showing that this drill-book is, what it claims to be, the result of the author's long experience in the classroom. The sounds are arranged and described under the letters of the alphabet by which they are represented, the only classification being that into vowels and consonants, and to each paragraph is added a number of well-chosen vocables for drill. As far as the pronunciation of a language can be taught properly by treating each word by itself, out of its position in connected discourse, it would seem to us that the author had performed his task well, and his drill-book will prove a reliable help to the student as well as to many teachers of Spanish; but its value would have been greatly enhanced by some attention to "satzphonetik." In regard to the pronunciation of *s* for instance (p. 14), we are told that "final *s* is frequently dropped in conversation when the next word begins with a consonant, especially *l, m, n, r*," but nothing is said of the fact that in the speech of Chile (and it was the intention of the author to note the peculiarities of pronunciation in the Spanish colonies of America) the *s* in this position tends to unvoice the following consonant, its disappearance being complete only before the voiceless spirants (STORM, 'E. Ph.,' p. 426). Touching colonial Spanish, it is again important to notice that in Lima, the capital of Peru, medial and final *r* is frequently replaced by *l* and still more generally by *d*, so that one hears for instance *queded* for *querer* (cf. *Boletim da Soc. de geogr.*, Lisbon 1882, 3d serie—no. 8, p. 476). It is pretty safe to say that too little is as yet known of colonial Spanish to give us anything like an accurate idea of its phonetic character. Here and there we find a statement that we should wish to see modified, as the following (p. 7): "when short, *o* sounds like *u* in *but*; as in *tonto*, *nombre*;" an assertion which is besides somewhat contradictory to one made p. 5: "It (the vowel *a*) has the *same* sound whether it is long or short, *and this is true of all Spanish vowels.*" Matters like these, however, are of small consequence in comparison with the many excellent qualities of PROF. KROEH's drill-book, which will no doubt prove a great service to both teachers and students of Spanish.

A new volume has recently been added to the German series of D. C. Heath & Co., Boston, by an edition of GOETHE's "Tasso," prepared by PROFESSOR CALVIN THOMAS. The editor avows in the preface that in preparing this edition he has addressed himself "rather to the student of literature, the student of GOETHE, than to the student of the German language in and for itself." And considered from this point of view the book must certainly be pronounced the best edition of a German classic issued in this country. Its principal value consists in the carefully prepared introduction, showing that the editor, with the aid of the German authorities, has himself made a diligent study of this drama. "Tasso" is one of the most difficult master-

pieces of GOETHE's dramatic art, which reveals its beauties only to mature minds. Hence it is more the obstacles of the subject-matter than those of the language which the editor has to aid in overcoming. No student who has not to a certain degree mastered the language should attempt to read this drama, and consequently there would be no propriety in overloading the notes with lexical and grammatical material, after the fashion of so many manipulators of texts. PROF. THOMAS's annotations are therefore but few and are concerned chiefly with the meaning of certain passages. Two or three points may be remarked upon here. The words *Einklang der Natur* contain more than a mere allusion to the ancient doctrine of the "music of the spheres," as the whole passage further on discloses. The "good German writers" who use "er fühlt sich *einen* Mann" for the correct "er fühlt sich *ein* Mann," we should like to have seen quoted. It is evidently by a slip of the pen that PROF. THOMAS speaks of the "fulsome adulation in the tone of a sixteenth century court poet;" he evidently means the *Dichterlinge* of the seventeenth century. Since this edition has been prepared, first of all, for the use of students, we do not see any reason for appendix ii. What good does it do the young men to know in which of the various editions a misprint occurs? Scientific exactness of this kind carried into the class room easily becomes ridiculous, while in a text for class use the *Goethekenner* least of all needs it. The innovations in German punctuation which the editor proposes and carries through in the text, commend themselves only as a step toward the subjective license of English writers in matters of punctuation. Despite these few exceptions, we can recommend PROF. THOMAS's excellent edition of "Tasso" as the best means of increasing among us the study of GOETHE's immortal drama.

PERSONAL.

DANIEL KILHAM DODGE, PH. D., a frequent contributor to our columns (cf. MOD. LANG. NOTES, vol. iii, pp. 8–9, 57–58, 123–24, etc.) and a former Fellow of Columbia College (N. Y.), has just returned from Copenhagen, where he spent the summer collecting materials for future publication. He has made some interesting finds in reference to the Old Danish element in English about which he intends to give his views to the readers of MOD. LANG. NOTES; he also copied the Old Danish MS. Life of Jerome (1488), which he hopes to publish soon with accompanying notes and word-list. DR. DODGE has just published a pamphlet, entitled "The Functions of University Fellowships," which will be noticed later in our columnes.

H. M. SCHMIDT-WARTENBERG, an earnest supporter of this journal (cf. MOD. LANG. NOTES, vol. ii, pp. 28-35, etc.), has been appointed Professor of Latin and German in the University of Deseret (Salt Lake City). After absolving his Gymnasium studies at Colberg (Germany) in 1881, MR. SCHMIDT entered upon the study of modern philology, spending one semester at the University of Jena, two semesters at Berlin and six semesters at Strasburg. Here he was a member of the English, Romance and Germanic seminaries for two years. He passed his *Staatsexamen* in 1885 and had begun his probationary year in Strasburg when he received a call to the Hoboken Academy (N. J.) as teacher of German. A part of the following year (1886-87) he spent in the University of North Carolina (Chapel Hill), where he temporarily filled the chair of Modern Languages in place of PROF. W. D. TOY (cf. MOD. LANG. NOTES, vol. ii, p. 94). In 1887 he was appointed Fellow in Romance Philology at Cornell University, from which institution he received the doctor's degree in June last, on presenting a thesis entitled: "Seneca's Influence on Robert Garnier."

CHARLES BUNDY WILSON, who is already known to our readers (cf. MOD. LANG. NOTES, vol iii, pp. 142-43), has been appointed Professor of Modern Languages and Literature in the State University of Iowa. PROF. WILSON is a graduate (1884) of Cornell University, where he devoted especial attention to modern languages during his college course. After graduation he spent about two years in study at the University of Zurich and the Collège de France, after which he was appointed Fellow in Modern Languages at his Alma Mater. In 1886 he received there the degree of A. M. on examination and the presentation of a thesis entitled: "Syntax of the Middle High German Popular Epics and of New High German." He was then appointed Instructor for German in the same institution, which position he continued to occupy until entering upon his present duties.

JOURNAL NOTICES.

LE MOYEN AGE, MARS 1888, NO. 3.—Baudoin, M. A., Lettres de Philippe le Bel. (Ch. V. Langlois). —**Schupfer,** L'Allodio (G. Platon).—**Thomas, A.,** Bertran de Born, (M. Wilmotte).—**Chronique bibliographique.—Périodiques: France,** Sociétés savantes de province (A. Marignan).—**Pays Scandinaves,** Histoire et Archéologie (Joh. Vising).—**Numismatique** (M. Prou).—**AVRIL, NO. 4.—Cadier, Leon,** Les Etats de Béarn (A. Brutails).—**Ficker,** Die Darstellung der Apostel in der altchristlichen Kunst (A. Marignan).—**de Lespinasse, René,** Cartulaire de la Charité-sur-Loire, (L. Finot).—**Paris, G. et Ulrich, J.,** Merlin, (M. W.).—**Chronique bibliographique.—Périodiques: France,** Sociétés savantes de province (A. Marignan).—**Italie,** Archéologie et Histoire (C. Frati).—**MAI, NO. 5, Schultz, Oscar,** Die Provenzalischen Dichterinnen (A. Tobler)—**Giry, A.,** Étude sur les origines de la Commune de St-Quentin (G. Platon).—**von Œchelhæuser, A.,** Die Miniaturen der Universitäts-Bibliothek zu Heidelberg (Carl Frey).—**Périodiques:** Philologie celtique (G. Dottin).—**Philologie romane,** (C. Grati, E. Muret, A. Thomas, M. Wilmotte).

GIORNALE STORICO DELLA LETTERATURA ITALIANA, VOL. XI (FASC. 1-2.)—Rossi, Vittorio, Di un poeta maccheronico e di alcune sue rime italiane.—**Rajna' Pio,** Intorno al cosiddetto "Dialogus Creaturarum" ed al suo autore. 5. Mayno e il Contemptus Sublimitatis (continuazione e fine).—**Scipione Scipioni, G.,** Alcune lettere e poesie di Costanza Monti Perticari.—*Varietà.*—**Renier, Rodolfo,** Un codice antico di flagellanti nella biblioteca comunale di Cortona.—**Frati, Ludovico,** Notizie biografiche di rimatori italiani die secc. XIII-XIV, IV. Ranieri Samaritani; V, Fabruzzo Lambertazzi; VI, Paolo Zoppo da Castello.—**Scherillo, Michele,** Un vero amore del Sannazaro.—**Zerbini, Elia,** Sonetti politici vernacoli.—**Cotronei, Bruno,** Il "Rinaldo" del Tasso ed il "Pastor fido" del Guarini.—**Luzio-Renier,** Commedie classiche in Ferrara nel 1499. —**Tenneroni, Annibale,** Laude di Jacopo da Montepulciano.—*Rassegna Bibliografica.*—**Novati, Francesco,** L. P[adrin], Lupati de Lupatis, Bovetini de Bovetinis, Albertini Mussati, necnon Jamboni Andreae de Favafuschis carmina quaedam ex cod. veneto nunc primum edita.—**Renier, Rodolfo,** Joanne Sabadino de li Arienti, Gynevera de le clare donne, ed. C. Ricci e A. Bacchi della Lega.—**Percopo, Erasmo,** Enrico Ciavarelli, Cariteo e le sue opere volgari.—**Cian, Vittorio,** Pierre de Nolhac, La bibliothèque de Fulvio Orsini.—*Bollettino bibliografico.—Comunicazioni ed appunti.—Cronaca.*—**VOL. XI (FASC. 3).**—*Varietà.*—**Graf, Arturo,** A proposito della "Visio Pauli."—**Rua, Giuseppe,** Gli accenni danteschi a Bertran de Born.—**Costa, Emilio,** Di un'elegia erroneamente attribuita ad Ercole Strozzi.—**Frati, Ludovico,** Di un poema poco noto di Giovanni Filoteo Achillini.—**Neri, Achille,** Gli "Intermezzi" del "Pastor fido."—*Rassegna Bibliografica.*—**Gaspary, Adolfo,** Francesco Torraca, La materia dell' Arcadia del Sonnazaro. Arcadia di Jacobo Sannazaro secondo i manoscritti e le prime stampe, ediz. Michele Scherillo.—**Scipioni, G. S.,** Alfredo Saviotti, Pandolfo Collenuccio umanista pesarese del sec. XV.—**Venturi, G. A.,** Alberto Aldini, La lirica nel Chiabrera. Ottavio Varaldo, Bibliografia delle opere a stampa diGabriello Chiabrera; Id. id., Bibliografia delle opere a stampa di Chiabrera. Supplemento. Severino Ferrari, Gabriello Chiabrera e le raccolte delle sue rime da lui medesimo ordinate.—**Trevisan, Francesco,** Antonio Ugoletti, Studj sui Sepolcri di Ugo Foscolo.—*Bollettino bibliografico.—Comunicazioni ed appunti.—Cronaca.*

ARCHIV FÜR DAS STUDIUM DER NEUEREN SPRACHEN UND LITTERATUREN, LXXXI. BAND, I U. 2 HEFT.—Baier, Dr. Gustav, Charakteristik der deutschen politischen Lyrik des dreizehnten Jahrhunderts.—**Horstmann, C.,** Proprium Sanctorum Zusatz-Homilien des Ms. Vernon fol. CCXV ff. zur nördlichen Sammlung der Dominicalia evangelia.—**Beyer, A.,** Studien zu William Cowpers Task.—**Hippe, Max,** Untersuchungen zu der mittelenglischen Romanze von Sir Amades. Erster Teil. Die Fabel des Gedichtes.—Sitzungen der Berliner Gesellschaft für das Studium der neueren Sprachen.—Jahresberichte der Dresdner Gesellschaft für neuere Philologie 1886-88.—*Beurteilungen und kurze Anzeigen.*—**Bulthaupt, H.,** Dumas, Sardou und die jetzige Franzosenherrschaft auf der deutschen Bühne. (Joseph Sarrazin).—**Burtin, E.** Premiers exercices de lecture et de récitation—**de Chiara, S.,** La "Pietra" di Dante e la "Donna gentile." (H. Buchholtz).—**Sanders, Prof. Dr. Daniel,** Zeitschrift für deutsche Sprache, Erstes und zweites Heft.—Entgegnung. (Dr. Gregor Krek).—*Bibliographischer Anzeiger.*

NUOVA ANTOLOGIA, FASC. IV.—Morandi, L., Lucrezia Romana in Arcadia.—**VI. Cesareo, G. A.,** Il naturalismo nel romanzo spagnuolo.—**VIII. Martini, F.,** La Fisima del Teatro nazionale I.—**IX. Chiarini, G.,** Le donne nei drammi dello Shakespeare e nel poema di Danti.—**Martini, F.,** La fisima del teatro nazionale. (Fine.)—**Cesareo, G. A.,** Rassegna delle letterature straniere (Spagnuola).—**X. Mazzoni, G.,** Sonetti inediti di Monti.—**D'Ovidio, F.,** Rassegna della litteratura italiana.—**XI. Chiarini, G.,** Giacomo Zanella.—**XII. Chiarini, G.,** La poesia non muore.—**Martini, F.,** Rassegna delle letterature straniere. (Francese).—**XIII. Nencioni, E.,** Roma e gli Scrittori inglesi.—**XIV. D'Ovidio, F.,** Madonna Laura.—**Cesareo, G. A.,** Rassegna delle letterature straniere. (Spagnuola).—**XV. D'Ovidio, F.,** Madonna Laura.—**Cesareo, G. A.,** Rassegna delle letterature straniere. (Spagnuola).—**XV. D'Ovidio, F.,** Madonna Laura.—**Chiarini, G.,** Rassegna delle letterature straniere. (Tedesca).

ENGLISCHE STUDIEN VOL. XII, PART II.—Brandl, A., Über einige historische anspielungen in den Chaucer-dichtungen.—**Elze, K.,** Notes on K. Richard II.—**Franz, W.,** Die dialectsprache bei Chas. Dickens.—**Breul, K.,** Das wissenschaftliche studium der neueren sprachen in Cambridge.—**Heymann, W.,** Über die lehre vom bestimmten artikel im Englischen.—*Reviews:*—**Morsbach, Lorenz,** Über den ursprung der nenenglischen schriftsprache (E. Koeppel).—**Einenkel, Eugen,** Streifzüge durch die mittelenglische syntax u. s. w. (Karl D. Bülbring).—**Murray, J. A. H.,** A New English Dictionary, etc. etc. (W. Sattler).—**Reinhardstoettner, Carl von,** Aufsätze und abhandlungen vornehmlich zur litteraturgeschichte (E. Nader).—**Wimmers, C.** und **Wattendorf, L.,** Englische schulgrammatik.—*Miscellen:* **Logemann, W. S.,** Zu den "Indicia monasterialia."—**Leonhard, R.,** Zu Beaumont und Fletcher's Knight of the burning pestle.—**Ackermann, R.,** Notitzen über den englischen unterricht in Bayern.—**Breul, K.,** Zu den schottischen Local Examinations.